INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY PUBLICATIONS

FRONTENAC AND THE JESUITS

JEAN DELANGLEZ

UNIVERSITAS LOYOLÆA CHICAGIENSIS
A.M.D.G.
FVND. A.D. MDCCCLXX

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 25 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

F1030
.F9274

FRONTENAC AND THE JESUITS

INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY PUBLICATIONS

FRONTENAC AND THE JESUITS

By

JEAN DELANGLEZ, S. J., PH. D.
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 25 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHICAGO
INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY
1939

Copyright, 1939, by Institute of Jesuit History

FOREWORD

This book is the result of a curious situation which arose while the author was writing a work on Cadillac and his relations with the Jesuits in the French colonial Northwest. For such a study of the affairs of the western scene at Michilimackinac and Detroit the obvious introduction was a discussion of the eastern area, where Frontenac held sway. The introduction began to take on book proportions and to assure the character of a distinct monograph, even though the main points of controversy agitated during Frontenac's first administration were the same as those causing trouble during Cadillac's incumbency. The strained relations between both administrators and the Jesuits were caused mainly by the brandy problem, by the alleged trading activities of the Jesuits, and by difficulties arising from the attempt to change Indians into Frenchmen. These questions were debated before Frontenac's time. He only added color to the controversies. He looms large in the following pages chiefly because of the abundance of documentation which was the outcome of his stay in New France and because he plunged into the debate with the energy of a born fighter.

Some critics are likely to be misled into pre-judging the book from its title. The basis of this prejudice will be twofold: first, the contents are controversial, and, secondly, since the Jesuits are involved, a Jesuit is not likely to write objectively about the whole affair. The attitude of prejudice, besides being in itself unscholarly, implies that Jesuits writing history now cannot be as honest as Jesuits who made history earlier. Moreover, it confounds the idea of writing about a controversy with the idea of being a controversialist. If the premise is followed to its logical conclusion and extended beyond the point of excluding Jesuits from writing on Jesuit affairs, some serious restrictions will have to be put on all historical writings; for by the same argument no Southerner and no Northerner can write objectively about the Civil War, neither Royalist nor Republican can write objectively about the French Revolution, neither Catholic nor Protestant about the Reformation. On the other hand it has too long been assumed that anyone attacking the Jesuits in this matter of their controversy with Frontenac is objective, while anyone defending their stand or interpreting the documents otherwise than in favor of Frontenac and other favorites of colonial times in French lands must necessarily be unobjective.

There is a remarkable number of deeply ingrained prejudices concerning French colonial characters and concepts. As in the case of old buildings a thorough sand blasting is required, before the depth or shallowness of the structure can be estimated. Whether or not the present study is objective can be settled quite simply by asking the following questions. First, has the available evidence been presented honestly, correctly, and fully? Secondly, have places where the evidence is to be found been indicated so that those who wish to do so can check it? Finally, is it clear where documentation ends and where inference and interpretation begins? So long as these questions can be answered in the affirmative there can be no objection to the historian stating his conclusions if in his judgment one side was right and the other wrong.

For permission to use passages from Thwaites' *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* acknowledgment is made to The Burrows Brothers Company, owners of the copyright.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD v

GOVERNOR AND GOVERNED

1. THE BASES OF CONFLICT 3
2. FRONTENAC AND THE SOVEREIGN COUNCIL . 5
3. FRONTENAC AND THE INTENDANTS . . . 9
4. FRONTENAC AND THE JESUITS 20

THE FRENCHIFICATION SCHEME

1. BEFORE FRONTENAC 35
2. DURING FRONTENAC'S FIRST TERM . . . 49

THE BRANDY TRADE

1. BEFORE TALON 69
2. DURING TALON'S TWO TERMS 79
3. DURING FRONTENAC'S TERM 101

THE TRADE OF THE JESUITS

1. BEFORE 1672 133
2. FRONTENAC'S INDICTMENT 165
3. LA SALLE'S ACCUSATIONS 212
4. THE TESTIMONY OF HENNEPIN, LE CLERCQ AND LE TAC 252
5. CONCLUSION 265

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES 271
PRINTED SOURCES 274
GENERAL WORKS AND SPECIAL STUDIES . . . 280

INDEX 287

GOVERNOR AND GOVERNED

GOVERNOR AND GOVERNED

SECTION 1. THE BASES OF CONFLICT

Many types of character appear in the narrative of the extension of the French colonial empire along the waterways of the North American continent. The hardy Norman and Breton fishermen had been long at their industry off the Newfoundland coasts before official France moved toward colonization in the New World. Awakened to the possibilities of colonial exploitation, Henry IV and his minister, Sully, sent Champlain into the Canadian scene at the opening of the seventeenth century. In the heart of what were then savage lands, Quebec was founded, the first of a series of settlements which were to spread through the St. Lawrence Valley, the Great Lakes Basin, and ultimately the Valley of the Mississippi. The concept of a colonial empire of such extent, based particularly upon the fur trade and held together by forts and trading posts, matured only with the years and the actual development of the interior empire was slow, but the view of it in retrospect and in broad outline has been considerably glorified and magnified. With this idea of a fur empire another ran concurrently through the years, namely, the concept of a Christianized empire and French civilization. The exponents of these two ideologies worked together during the time of Champlain to effect the crown purpose in both details of trade and religion. The religious obtained for the missionary advance were the Jesuits.

At the passing of Champlain in 1635, three years had elapsed since the return of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. From 1635 until 1660 they were the dominant factors in maintaining Champlain's foundations, in extending the French control by means of missions, and in the governance of the entire area. Their concept of what the colony should be spiritually had swung into the foreground, although combatted at every step of its development toward the Great Lakes by the savages, by medicine men, and by semi-civilized or uncontrollable coureurs de bois. In 1660, the year after the appointment of François de Laval to the first episcopal see of New France, Louis XIV, entering the period of his long personal rule, and bent upon centralization, ordered a reorganization of the government of New France. In 1663, he created the Sovereign Council, consisting of the governor, the bishop, and members conjointly appointed by the bishop and the governor.

The personality dominating the history of New France in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, was Louis de Buade, Count de Palluau and de Frontenac. Frontenac is the best known governor of colonial Canada. Some admirers have gone so far as to call him "the Great." His first term of office ending in 1682 brought out little remarkable administrative achievements or ability in proof of greatness; rather his rule looms as a distinct failure. His failure lay essentially in his inability to reconcile and to utilize to their fullest extent the two groups, the official and the religious, toward a satisfactory completion of the royal purpose. His added years and his former experience do not seem to have much improved his administrative ability during his second governorship from 1689 until 1698. According to Louis XIV, who by reason of his own qualities as ruler must be considered a judge of good and bad administrators, Frontenac's second term was worse than his first.[1] New France was again in turmoil chiefly because of the high-handed, more narrowly conceived and individualistic government of Frontenac.

A minute examination of the career of Frontenac in each of its aspects need not arrest the progress of this chapter, since the details of his colonial work are to be brought out in later pages. Frontenac first took charge at a time when the Jesuits in view of two score years of active, extensive, and approved labors appeared secure in certain assigned and prescriptive rights in relation to the Indians.

---

[1] Louis XIV to Frontenac and Champigny, June 4, 1695, in *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1928-1929,* 262; cf. Pontchartrain to Frontenac, June 4, 1695, *ibid.,* 251; *id.* to *id.,* June 8, 1695, *ibid.,* 253. Since most of Frontenac's correspondence with the Court and the answers from Paris are printed in the *Rapports,* references to this collection will hereinafter be given as follows: RAPQ, and the year of publication; the press-marks of the documents in the Archives des Colonies, Paris (AC) will precede whenever the printed page has been compared with the Library of Congress photostats.

The Jesuits were still proponents of their long cherished plan of Christianization. Hardships and death by torture and fire were expected by them, were met heroically, and even welcomed. They considered the brandy trade as especially inimical to the welfare of the Indians and progress of the missions. The deeds of drink-crazed savages were horrifying, and the men who made possible fire-water orgies were considered by the missionaries as sinners against God and disobedient subjects of the king. Around the trade of brandy for peltries may be grouped as corollaries all other questions subsequently to be discussed. Such problems were the social and religious organization of the villages, the Frenchification of the natives, the trade of the Jesuits, and arguments over authority and jurisdiction. There were conflicts of personalities, of motives, of ideas, involving on the one hand the Jesuits, and on the other most prominently Frontenac and his backers. For, while the Jesuits placed an inestimable value upon the souls of the Indians, the officials looked to the value of peltries, putting animal furs above savage souls and condoning the demoralizing brandy traffic, since it was a stimulant, however temporary, to a faltering trade empire. The old issue between the spiritual and the merely temporal concepts of the Indians and colony became squarely joined.

SECTION 2. FRONTENAC AND THE SOVEREIGN COUNCIL

Frontenac assumed a definite attitude toward the administrative and economic situation, toward the clerical body, and toward the Jesuits. Almost as soon as he arrived in Canada in September 1672, he convened the Sovereign Council, he appointed himself its president, and administered the oath of allegiance, which bound the members "faithfully to serve the King, each according to his functions, under the authority which it pleased His Majesty to give Frontenac in this province."[1] Six weeks later he convened the "Estates General" in the chapel of the Jesuits for the administration of another oath[2] to the clergy, the nobility, the magistrates, and the third estate.[3] In the same place in early 1673, he called a meeting of the people of Quebec, a popular assemblage which at his behest was to choose six aldermen. The elect were to examine a police regulation drawn up by himself.[4] This body was Frontenac's creation, a ceremonial group more than a democratic assembly,[5] and an imitation of the court pageantry long discarded by French rulers. The election of aldermen was in itself an excellent measure, yet as they were to have no authority, it was for show, and was in no wise a release of power to others. The second article of the ordinance instituting the aldermen indicated their status. They had to be confirmed "by us or by those who will succeed us, and if they judge it apropos or necessary for the good of the king's service, they may dismiss the aldermen and appoint others to take their places."[6] The good of the king's service was an elastic formula; what the good might be, only the governor could say. At least, Frontenac so thought. But the king soon made clear other ideas about what was best for his service.

---

[1] *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle-France, 1663-1710,* 6 vols., Quebec, 1885-1891, I, 691, hereinafter to be quoted as *Jugements et délibérations.*

Frontenac, possibly with the pride of creation, possibly with the expectation of praise, possibly as a mere matter of duty, and possibly because he felt himself a sharer in the Divine Right of Kings, notified his master of the meeting of the "Estates General" and of the newly founded board of aldermen.[7] Why he supposed the Grand Monarch or his minister Colbert would countenance such a revolutionary scheme remains incomprehensible, unless it was that Frontenac knew he was giving over no authority to a colonial body. Jean Talon, the former intendant, remained free from what taint the innovation might bring by diplomatically absenting himself from the deliberations.[8] Colbert's response to the announcement was chilling. Frontenac was told to follow the form in force in the metropolis. The minister continued more explicitly: "You ought only very rarely, or—to speak more correctly—never give that form [Estates General] to the corporate body of inhabitants of that country." Later he ordered the suppression even of the Syndic who presented petitions in the name of the inhabitants, since "it is proper that each speak for himself, and that no one speak for all."[9]

---

[2] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 21.

[3] Prestations de sermens, AC F 3, 4:105-105v. Cf. the "harangue prononcee par Mons^{r} le comte de frontenac en l'assemblée tenüe a Quebec le 23^{e} 8^{bre} 1672," AC, C 11A, 3:225-231v, printed in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXIII, 1927, 735-738.

[4] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 27. The police regulations dated March 23, 1673, in AC, F 3, 4:109-118v.

[5] H. Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac,* Paris, 1895, 29.

[6] Reglement de police, AC, F 3, 4:112.

[7] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 21, 27.

The fighting governor's disinclination toward democracy is manifest in his dealings with the Sovereign Council, the deliberative body created by the king under his predecessor. The observant Baron Lahontan pictured him as using the members "as roughly as Cromwell did the Parliament of England."[10] In the preamble of the minutes of the first meeting of the Council one may find an indication of the relation likely to exist between himself and his councillors. His predecessors were referred to as *Monsieur le Gouveneur,* he was *Haut et Puissant Seigneur,* "High and Mighty Lord."[11] Conflict was bound to arise.

The royal edict of 1663 had been specific regarding the method of appointment of five councillors. This was to be done by the governor and the bishop conjointly.[12] Frontenac in his desire to fill the body with men wholly devoted and subservient to himself and willing to humor his whims, embarked upon a series of arbitrary acts of appointment which could have only one effect. When the reports of such abuses of power reached Paris, the king reorganized the Sovereign Council, by the declaration of June 1675. There is a note of humor in the word "reorganization," for the king aimed directly at a deflation as far as the power of Frontenac was concerned. No longer were the governor and bishop conjointly to nominate councillors, no longer could the term of one year be prolonged at the discretion of the appointers. The appointments were to be made directly by the king.[13] Moreover, in a later edict, Louis XIV explained that the charge entrusted to the councillors was fixed, so that the councillors giving themselves to the study of law and to the service of the people would the better be able to administer justice.[14] But His Majesty's crowning innovation was the introduction of the intendant into the Council, not as a mere member but as the real head of the body.[15] Thus in New France as in New Spain officials were set to act as checks, one upon the other. It is argued that such a measure was bound to cause trouble, especially when a governor happened to be as avid of authority as was Frontenac. But Colbert apparently thought Frontenac had no reason to complain, and he saw no reason why any kingly distribution of colonial power should become a source of conflict between two officials. The king could do no wrong.

---

[8] Frontenac excused the absence of the intendant on the plea that Talon was ill, Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 21; it must have been a very mild sickness, for two days after the meeting of the "Estates General," on October 26, 1672, Talon assisted at the meeting of the Sovereign Council, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 700.

[9] Colbert to Frontenac, June 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 25. Six letters of Colbert and of Louis XIV to Frontenac are in Pierre Clément, *Instructions et Mémoires de Colbert,* 7 vols., Paris, 1861-1873, volume III, part 2, 558-559, hereinafter quoted as Clément, III^2, and some of the correspondence has been translated into English in *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York,* Albany, 1855, vol. IX, 95, hereinafter quoted as NYCD. See the minister's comments on the election of the aldermen, Colbert to Frontenac, April 17, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 56, and Frontenac's explanations, AC, C 11A, 4:64-64v; RAPQ, 1927, 61.

[10] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North America,* Thwaites edition, Chicago, 1905, I, 45.

[11] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 689, cf. 707, 786, 889, etc.

[12] *Edits, ordonnances royaux, déclarations et arrêts du Conseil d'Etat du Roi concernant le Canada,* 3 vols., Quebec, 1854-1856, I, 38, hereinafter quoted as *Edits.*

The point was delicate, for Frontenac felt himself to have some of these kingly attributes. He was deeply offended. He had forgotten he was a servant. The shearing process left him with functions pertaining solely to military matters. Tax gathering and administrative control were to be in the hands of the intendant. Social, religious, intellectual, and moral affairs were to be in the hands of the bishop. Close-cropped was he of dignities. Duchesneau, coming to Canada in 1675, was intendant and president of the reorganized Council, and Frontenac had no intention of yielding to him the first place which he had held for the previous three years. On the other hand Duchesneau soon made it clear that he was not of a mind to act as a mere secretary to the governor. Frontenac's utter lack of diplomatic taste, or his egotism, or his ignorance of the long established French system of checks led him to protest to the Crown. An astonished Court replied in the person of Colbert and definitely settled the official relationships.

---

[13] *Ibid.,* 83-84.
[14] *Ibid.,* 300.
[15] *Ibid.,* 84.

> The king commands me to tell you that he is astonished at your pretentions to those two titles, chief and president of the Sovereign Council, which run absolutely contrary to his will made known by his declaration of June 5, 1675. His Majesty is all the more astonished because you are the only one in the kingdom who, as appointed Governor and Lieutenant General of a country, should ask for such an increase of honors and dignities as those of chief and president of the council.
>
> Furthermore, in as much as your main function lies in seeing that the king is obeyed, and in seeing that his edicts, his declarations, and his general and particular orders are executed, His Majesty cannot rely upon you for this your first and prime function; since you wish to infringe this order and to assume a dignity which is absolutely denied you by the declaration of 1675. Thus His Majesty not only wishes you to desist from such baseless pretention, but he ordered me to send an *arrêt* containing his will, which *arrêt* is to be registered by the Sovereign Council.[16]

SECTION 3. FRONTENAC AND THE INTENDANTS

The relative jurisdictions included in the offices of governor and of intendant were evidently quite clear to the mind of the Court. So too were the honors and dignities attached to each position, even though Frontenac chose to view them otherwise. But the Minister of the Crown had only emphasized the line of cleavage in colonial Canada between the incumbent officials, and disputes ensued. Frontenac has found apologists of his régime and policies. In the camp of his opponents there were two intendants during Frontenac's two terms, Duchesneau and Champigny, and besides, the "High and Mighty Lord" was generally at loggerheads during his twenty years in Canada with everyone there invested with any kind of authority, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Undoubtedly, he would have quarreled with Talon[1] had not the great intendant finished his term and asked for a recall on the score of ill health.[2] The fault of the other two intendants consists, in the eyes of Frontenac's partisans, in their refusal to submit to the control of the Governor. Jacques Duchesneau has been reviled for his insubordination, yet, it was his place as president of the Council that Frontenac had designs upon, to the royal astonishment and condemnation. Some defenders of Frontenac might readily have forgiven or condoned the stand of the two civil officials against Frontenac, had they not fallen into error much more grave. Duchesneau and Champigny happened to have been on good terms with the ecclesiastical authorities. Worse still, they were, and especially Champigny, friendly to the Jesuits. This lapse was beyond remission.

---

[16] Colbert to Frontenac, April 20, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 112; the date of this letter in Clément, III^2, 642, is given as December 4, 1679.

With due respect for the opinion of proponents of Frontenac's ability an offhand observer might readily remark that all in the Court and colony appeared "out of step" except the "High and Mighty Lord." An objective student will not observe any great display of administrative talent in Frontenac. Nor did the king, to whom he was a subaltern whose prime duty it was to obey. Frontenac in reality was a cog in the complicated machinery of government, but practically he was placing himself apart from the machinery of the king's designing and was moreover assuming a stature far out of proportion to his importance in relation to the king's colonial enterprises. In his instructions to Frontenac as a newly appointed Governor, Louis XIV had demanded emphatically of him a rule which would tend toward "procuring for all the inhabitants of New France the same peace and repose enjoyed by other subjects of His Majesty."[3] Whatever one may think of the peace and repose of the other subjects of His Majesty, and whatever interpretation Frontenac gave to the words, the governor soon had the colony in turmoil. Colbert, who must be considered a capable judge of statesmen and administrators, spotted the source of the trouble and in no mincing words told Frontenac:

---

[1] Cf. Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 18-19; F. X. Garneau, *Histoire du Canada,* Quebec, 1859, I, 206; T. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* Quebec, 1904, 434 ff.

[2] Louis XIV to Talon, May 17, 1672, AC, B 4:58v; RAPQ, 1931, 167.

> His Majesty ordered me to explain his intentions to you emphatically, and to tell you first that he has agreed to let you stay the remainder of this year in Canada in the hope that there will be a change in the conduct you have followed until now, because His Majesty clearly sees that you have been incapable of living in the spirit of union and condescendence necessary to prevent all the divisions which take place in that country, and which are always the principal cause of the fall and ruin of new colonies.[4]

This was no idle threat. Evidence of the serious attitude of Colbert comes in the form of the letter sent to Canada in the same year, 1680, by M. Tronson, the superior of the Sulpicians in Paris. Tronson was close to Colbert and knew how the minister felt; he was much listened to, and, if we may trust a document to be analyzed below, he was the spiritual director of Colbert.[5] The letters of M. Tronson clearly indicate his high standing with the minister. On March 1, 1680, Tronson wrote to Dollier de Casson, then superior of the Sulpicians of Montreal:

> The third advice I am giving you is to continue to treat those in power with consideration, for they desire here nothing more than peace, and nothing is more to be desired for the good of the colony and for the sake of the tranquility of the inhabitants. I do not know yet how matters will be set in order this year, for they have not yet begun to attend to them, and everything is postponed until after the king's journey. . . . The gentlemen

---

[3] Mémoire du Roi pour servir d'instruction au Sieur Comte de Frontenac, April 7, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 4; NYCD, IX, 86.

[4] Colbert to Frontenac, April 20, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 112; the line speaking of Frontenac's recall is missing in RAPQ, see Clément, III2, 641. Cf. the letters of Pontchartrain to Frontenac of June 4, and June 8, 1695, RAPQ, 1929, 251, 253.

[5] P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale, (1614-1754)*, 6 vols., Paris, 1876-1888, I, 400, hereinafter quoted as Margry.

of the Company [that is, the revenue contractors] have given M. Colbert long memoirs against M. de Frontenac. I do not know what the outcome will be.[6]

Three weeks later M. Tronson again wrote to Dollier. As yet he did not know how the complaints to Colbert against Frontenac would be taken.[7] In June, he clearly indicated that he knew in what tone Frontenac and Duchesneau had been addressed by Colbert. He asked Dollier to let him know whether the measures taken by the government to end the divisions existing in Canada had really brought about the necessary peace in the colony. Harmony between the governor and the intendant is what is most desired, he asserted, and then added in code: "Both [Frontenac and Duchesneau] have strong supporters, but if this disunion lasts, you will certainly see some change next year. Let this be a secret between the two of us."[8]

The reorganization of the Sovereign Council had not put an end to Frontenac's difficulties with the councillors. Moreover, Frontenac had descended to a series of petty acts which are distressing to record. Quarrels of a village nature, bickerings about the position of honor in church, the exiling of two councillors and the attorney-general, the seance of March 7, 1679, at which he manifested his notion of his "dignity," each consumed time daily which should have been devoted to the transaction of affairs of the colony. Prior to the banishment of the councillors, he condescended to be called *Monsieur* and not *Monseigneur,* until the decision of the king was known.[9] The decision came in the following year. Louis XIV, in his letter of April 29, 1680, appraised at its true worth the statesmanship of Sieur de Frontenac. The act of exiling the councillors and attorney-general was categorized as an abuse of authority, and the complaints of the governor against the intendant were waved aside in view of the heap of charges made against the governor. Obviously, the fighting governor's irascibility and inefficiency rather than Duchesneau's perverseness were the causes of the colonial turmoil. Said the king:

---

[6] Tronson to Dollier, March 1, 1680, n. 96. On this correspondence of M. Tronson with the Sulpicians of Montreal, cf. O. Maurault, "Les lettres de M. Tronson," in *La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique, Rapport 1936-1937,* 11-19. The present writer saw copies of these letters in the Dominion Archives, Ottawa.

[7] Tronson to Dollier, March 20, 1680, n. 97.

[8] *Id.* to *id.,* June 4, 1680, n. 129.

[9] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 289. One of Frontenac's secretaries hauled before the Sovereign Council refused to answer the questions put to him unless his master be referred to as *Monseigneur le Gouverneur* instead of *Monsieur le Gouverneur, ibid.,* 524, 532. In the funeral oration pronounced by Father Goyer, the panegyrist spoke of Frontenac's avidity to hear the word of God, *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* I, 1895, 74; the annotator commented that the governor "only came to hear the sermon if the preacher addressed the sermon to him and called him *Monseigneur,* otherwise he would not come, or if he did come, he hid himself," *ibid.,* 107.

> The complaints of all the public bodies and of nearly every individual arriving in France from Canada are so clearly substantiated that I can no longer doubt their truth. Your numerous bad treatments are absolutely contrary to the moderation expected of you toward all the inhabitants to keep them in that order and union which I so much recommended to you in my instructions and in my despatches. My tax collectors complain that trade is poor and is gradually coming to nothing owing to the coureurs de bois; they complain that they find no protection in you, and that you do not allow the ships to leave when they are ready to sail, that you do not allow navigation on the rivers without your leave and your passports. The Bishop and his priests, the Jesuits and the Sovereign Council, in a word all the public bodies, all the private persons in the colony complain of you.

The king expressed hopes for a change in conduct in these various respects. Surely, the king was aware of Frontenac's unreasonable fits of anger at resistance, which have been likened to those of a spoiled child.[10] He wanted to bring his servant to actions appropriate to a man's estate. He outlined for him the program a governor should have before his eyes as his goal. He recommended in particular:

> . . . banish from your mind all the difficulties which you too easily and too lightly allowed to arise there. Consider well the post in which I placed you, and the honor you have of representing my person in that country, which must elevate you infinitely above all those difficulties, and oblige you to bear with many things on the part of the public and of individual settlers, which

---

[10] Cf. C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle,* 3 vols, Paris, 1895-1896, III, 98, hereinafter quoted as Rochemonteix.

are of no account in comparison to the submissive obedience they have for my orders and with whom I have every reason to be satisfied; and when this principal point of obedience and submission is so well established as it is, you must act with all moderation, and rather suffer offences of trifling consequence, in order to reach the object which must be your principal aim—to increase and strengthen that colony, and draw thither numbers of inhabitants by the protection and good treatment you afford the old settlers. And you perceive clearly that your maxims are far from those which you have hitherto observed. You have driven away the principal inhabitants, and you have forced many persons, through special discontent, to return to France. Reflect more particularly, that to accomplish the ends which I set before you neither interest nor favor for any one is necessary. To afford an extensive freedom to all merchants and all ships that carry any trade thither; to excite continually all the inhabitants to agriculture, commerce, manufacture, fisheries, and other profitable enterprises whereby they may be confined to their work and settlements, and prevented from wandering through the woods in search of an advantage which tends to the entire ruin of the colony, and of the little commerce it may have; in these few words consist the burden and end of your entire duty, and of what you can do to render your services agreeable to me.[11]

Frontenac's answer to this letter of Louis XIV does not seem to be extant, but in one presumably addressed to the Marshall de Bellefonds, he claims to be misunderstood and calumniated. No governor, he avers, ever gave such examples of patience and forbearance as he, and he is the man who perhaps contributed least of all to the divisions and disunions existing in the colony.[12]

The unanimity of complaints against Frontenac and the attitude of Louis XIV are a clear indication that the "greatest governor" ever sent to New France was generally regarded as a dismal failure. Even Lorin, his admirer *à outrance,* admits that Frontenac was fighting his opponents.

---

[11] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 29, 1680, AC, C 11A, 5:198-202v; RAPQ, 1927, 113-116. The translation of the last paragraph is taken from NYCD, IX, 139-140; separated from the rest of the letter as it is in this collection, the paragraph does not mean very much.

[12] Frontenac to [Marshal Bellefonds], November 14, 1680, AC, C 11A, 5:158. The words "au Maréchal de Bellefons" were added by a modern hand, but it is signed by Frontenac, printed in RAPQ, 1927, 117-118.

While he had such a high idea of his duties toward the commonwealth in that distant country where the king had entrusted him with the mission to develop the French domain; while he would willingly have devoted himself wholly to this task, great enough to fill his whole life, Colbert had appointed a spy to dog his footsteps, the Intendant Duchesneau.[13]

The argument seems to resolve itself into this: Frontenac had a high idea of his duty and willingness to perform it, but Colbert by means of Duchesneau's espionage had him handcuffed. Since the assertions are unsubstantiated it is difficult to see in what manner Duchesneau obstructed Frontenac's ideas and prevented their execution, if the governor really had in view the peace, progress, and prosperity of the colony. Louis XIV assuredly had a high ideal for his representatives, but this cannot be attributed gratuitously to Frontenac, especially in the face of Frontenac's failures as pointed out by the sovereign. And even though defects had been indicated and a method of procedure outlined, Frontenac continued his previous conduct. In 1681, the king was thoroughly dissatisfied and wrote to the governor that he was aware of one thing: "You have not executed my orders on one of the most important points regarding my service," to wit, fostering peace and union. He mentioned also the "animosity you betray in all your letters." Frontenac was told to divest himself "of all sorts of private animosities which until now have been almost the only motive of all your actions." The king could no longer believe what Frontenac wrote, "for I clearly see that you sacrifice everything to your private enmities."[14]

Louis XIV, it is true, in his letter to Duchesneau of the same year, blamed the intendant for the divisions, and said there was as much misunderstanding between him and Frontenac as there had been the year before, and if there were no change, he would have to recall Duchesneau.[15] Colbert, in the covering letter, threatened Duchesneau, stating that if the same animosity against Frontenac again appeared, the next letter he received from Paris would contain his recall.[16] But, as will be seen, there was an added reason for Colbert's manifest impatience with the intendant.

---

[13] Lorin, 159.

[14] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 30, 1681, AC, C 11A, 5:349v, 350, 357, 358; Clément, III^2, 644-649.

[15] *Id.* to Duchesneau, April 30, 1681, AC, B 8:80, 84.

Once more one may turn to M. Tronson's letters, which reflect Colbert's reaction much better than the official despatches sent to Canada. Colbert certainly spoke of the turmoil to the Sulpician. M. Tronson wrote in code to Dollier:

> They [*on,* scl. the king and the minister] are very much dissatisfied with M. de Frontenac. I spoke for you and said that you had every reason to be pleased with him.[17] I don't know where all this will end. I said what I ought about M. the Intendant. With regard to M. Perrot [the governor of Montreal] I am much solicited to spare him and to say nothing about him yet. . . .[18]

What Tronson said on behalf of the intendant has not been found. The Sulpician was in correspondence with Frontenac as well as with Duchesneau, and it is surmised from his letters that he found some excuses for the intendant,[19] who needed some defenders, for the governor's party was hotly against him in Paris.[20]

Shortly after the king and his minister had written to the governor and the intendant as quoted above, Tronson knew the recall was not to take place in 1681. "There will be no change in the government this year. Everything is postponed till next year. . . . Disunion displeases, and they are satisfied with nobody. You can be sure that this will not last longer. . . ."[21]

As the letters leaving Canada for France in the winter of 1681 showed no improvement in the conditions, on May 9, 1682, the king sent the order of recall:

> Monsieur le Comte de Frontenac. Being satisfied with the services you rendered me in the commandement I entrusted to you

---

[16] Colbert to Duchesneau, May 2, 1681, AC, B 8:84-84v.

[17] Cf. Tronson to Frontenac, June 2, 1681, n. 146.

[18] Tronson to Dollier, April 7, 1681, n. 132.

[19] Tronson to Duchesneau, June 1, 1681, n. 145. "All I could do was to expose the correctness of your intentions."

[20] Dudouyt to Laval, April 11, and May 10, 1681, Archives du Séminaire (Laval University), Quebec, hereinafter quoted as ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, n. 54 and 57.

[21] Tronson to Dollier, May 25, 1681, n. 133. The passage quoted is in code, and the letter is addressed "to M. Dollier alone"; cf. *id.* to *id.,* 1681, n. 151, *id.* to Laval, June 15, 1681, n. 152; Dudouyt to Laval, May 10, 1681, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, n. 57.

in my country of New France, I am writing to you this letter that you are to return to my court on the first ship which will leave Quebec for France.[22]

It has been observed that the "satisfaction" of the king was merely a "polite formula, since Frontenac was recalled to France in 1682, precisely because the king was not satisfied with his conduct."[23] Similar "satisfaction" is said to have been expressed by the king when he sent Frontenac back to Canada in 1689. Yet Father Goyer, who preached a panegyric on Frontenac, described an audience the governor had had with Louis XIV in which the king said: "I send you back to Canada where I trust you will serve me as well as you did before. I ask nothing more of you."[24] Lorin comments thus on this passage: "The story of this interview with the king, so honorable for Frontenac, *must be authentic,* for the malicious annotator of the funeral oration of the Count wrote nothing in the margin contradicting the panegyrist."[25] Lorin's conclusion regarding authenticity and the reason given for the silence of the annotator are rare items. Indeed, the critic repeatedly refers to the fact that he is only objecting to such statements of the panegyrist as were known by everyone in Canada to be false.[26] How then could he contradict a statement supposed to have been made by Louis XIV in a private audience? And how will the admirer of Frontenac explain the king's letter of a few years later to the governor with whom he was so well satisfied, which letter branded Frontenac's second term in office as worse than his first?

---

[22] Louis XIV to Frontenac, May 9, 1682, RAPQ, 1927, 141.

[23] RAPQ, 1927, *Introduction,* 2.

[24] *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* I, 1895, 70. With regard to this audience M. Tronson wrote to Dollier, May 1, 1689, n. 406, "At last M. le Marquis [*sic*] de Frontenac obtained, through his perseverance and the intervention of his friends to return to Canada. . . . He had a favorable, a very favorable audience with His Majesty, he kindly related to me what was said." M. Tronson does not say what the king told Frontenac. In his letter to M. de Belmont, a good friend of the governor, written six weeks later, June 19, 1689, no. 410, he makes no mention of the audience. "Le roi a nommé M. de Frontenac pour aller commander en Canada. . . . et le roi lui a dit qu'il avoit bien connu que les mauvais offices qu'on lui avoit voulu rendre pendant qu'il étoit si éloigné n'étoient pas fondés," (May 8, 1689), *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau. . . .* , Paris, 1860, II, 390. "Il avoit tellement gagner la confiance des sauvages la première fois qu'il eut cet emploi qu'on fut obligé de le prier d'y retourner." *Mémoires de Saint-Simon,* A. de Boislisle, ed., 25 vols., Paris, 1879-1913, VI, 166.

[25] Lorin, 357; italics inserted.

[26] Parkman wrote that Jacques Viger suggested Bertrand de la Tour as the annotator of the funeral oration, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV,* Boston, 1891, 434, note 1. G. Stewart in J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America,* IV, 357, and

The recall of Frontenac from Canada in 1682 was not due, as Lorin asserts, to the "Canada-mission party,"[27] but

---

in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* ser. 1, III, 1886, sect. 2, 41, stated that Abbé Casgrain informed him that the comments were from the caustic pen of Abbé Charles Glandelet who came to Canada in 1675. There ought to be no hesitation between La Tour and Glandelet. The former came to Canada in 1729; since the annotator constantly refers to what he knew of his own knowledge, and opposes this knowledge of the events to that of the panegyrist who had only been a short time in the colony when Frontenac died. In ASQ, *Polygraphie,* no.28, where the original is found a note in the index has: "Le tout [funeral oration and remarks] paraît de l'écriture de M. de Glandelet." On the wrapper of the document a note signed A. E. G(osselin) reads: "These remarks are attributed to M. Glandelet. The handwriting, it is true, looks like his. However, this seems to me much better written than the abbé was wont to write and it is certainly neater. M. Glandelet's handwriting was in general rather bad." Later, another note, signed as above, was added: "Everything considered, this is in M. Glandelet's handwriting, but who will prove that these remarks are his, and that they were not copied by him together with the funeral oration?" A comparison of the various documents certainly in Glandelet's handwriting, for instance, the marginal notes of the letter of March 21, 1696, *Lettres* Carton M, no. 21, leads to the same conclusion as that reached by Mgr Gosselin. It would seem that the difficulty as to whether M. Glandelet did not merely copy the remarks finds a beginning of solution in another letter of the abbé. Above were quoted the annotator's comments on Frontenac requiring to be addressed directly and called Monseigneur by the preacher when the governor went to hear the sermon. In a letter of M. Glandelet to Tremblay, the abbé is asking his correspondent what should be done, that is, should they follow the lead of the Recollects who in the pulpit compare Frontenac to St. Louis, "addressing him as *Monseigneur* and *Excellence,* calling him a zealous Defender of the Faith, the protector and supporter of the Church, the savior of the country, saying that he is a man of extraordinary and edifying piety, and giving him other glorious titles, all of which appears as unbearable flattery to the *gens de bien* who see exactly the opposite. . . ." The bishop was not in Quebec at the time, and continues M. Glandelet: "There is something else which embarrasses us [the priests of the Séminaire]. From the pulpit the Recollects and the Jesuits address themselves directly to M. de Frontenac. We asked my said Lord [Bishop Saint-Vallier] what we should do. He answered that the Jesuits and the Recollects did not want to get into trouble with Frontenac, but that as far as we were concerned it was none of our business, and that we should not address the sermon to him [Frontenac]. This places us in the necessity of either preaching or of having a quarrel with M. de Frontenac; as a result we are not preaching." Glandelet to Tremblay, September 3, 1691, ASQ, *Lettres* Carton M. no. 11.

[27] Lorin, 162.

rather to the congenital inability of the governor to live at peace with anybody except a small coterie of subordinate officials and *coureurs de bois* who were willing to pay for his protection. The "enemies" who ultimately brought about his removal were neither the ecclesiastics nor the Jesuits, even though they might have been pleased in quite a human way to be rid of the author of many petty vexations, but the merchants and revenue contractors in France. Their task was singularly facilitated by what was known in Paris of his position and activities; as a governor whose duty it was to procure tranquillity for the king's subjects, Frontenac seemed determined on dividing the colony, on initiating quarrels, and on fostering dissensions. These are the two prime reasons for his first recall. They were intimately linked, for if either one had been absent the governor would have continued on in New France in 1682. Again in 1695, the revenue contractors nearly had him recalled a second time, for the same reasons as those of 1682. Instead of forcing the recall, they secured a measure from the king by which the trade permits were suppressed. This measure, coupled with the fact that Champigny was a more easy-going intendant than Duchesneau had been, spared Frontenac a second disgrace.

In concluding this brief survey of the relations between Frontenac and the Court on the question of his claim to the presidency of the Sovereign Council and his violent actions in its regard, Lorin may be quoted once more:

> Frontenac had overstepped the limits, and the first wrongs committed here are all his. Always obsessed by that idea that he was the direct representative of the king, and that he must not tolerate any encroachment on the sovereign authority which he had been delegated to maintain, he was, as Colbert very well noted, incapable of "fostering union and being condescending for the prevention of all divisions . . . which are always the principal cause of the ruin of new colonies."[28]

If Frontenac had been conscious of his position as representative of the king, he would have followed his lord's instructions. To the king's mind he acted as a disobedient servant, and thus became the embodiment of "encroachment on the sovereign authority." He assumed the position of judge with respect to Duchesneau and all others, a position not conceded to him as governor. His obsession, in fine, seems to be not that he was the delegated representative of the king, but that he was himself a "High and Mighty Lord." The statement that he opened the quarrel over the presidency of the Sovereign Council, seems to imply that in other instances his adversaries took the first step. There were very few cases, as later pages will reveal, wherein Frontenac did not play the part of instigator of dissensions.

---

[28] Lorin, 153.

SECTION 4. FRONTENAC AND THE JESUITS

Frontenac came to Canada prejudiced against the Franco-Canadian clergy. He believed, or affected to believe, that they extended their authority over temporal affairs. This idea had been instilled in him by Colbert before his departure for New France. The great minister was morbidly jealous of the king's authority; he carefully instructed the governor to prevent any encroachment upon it by the ecclesiastics, and specifically by the Jesuits. When Frontenac arrived in Canada he could not have failed to observe that the clergy governed authoritatively the consciences of the people, that the decisions of the Church were respectfully and submissively accepted by the great majority of the faithful. All this was within the limits of their functions. But the influence of the clergy wounded the pride of Frontenac, who was by nature chronically indisposed to tolerate a rival power,[1] much less a superior one, even though it should be in the spiritual realm. From the first day of his tenure of office, Frontenac resolved to break the power of the Jesuits.[2] To attain his end he was to look for support from the Sulpicians of Montreal and from the Recollects of Quebec.

> For the Jesuit Fathers who are established at Quebec, being the first who carried the light of the faith and of the Gospel

---

[1] Cf. *Relations inédites de la Nouvelle-France, (1672-1679) pour faire suite aux anciennes Relations, (1615-1672)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1861, I, xxii. This will be quoted hereinafter as *Relations inédites*.

[2] Rochemonteix, III, 122-123.

> to New France, and who by their virtue and piety contributed to the settlement and augmentation of that colony, His Majesty desires that Sieur de Frontenac have great consideration; but in case they should desire to carry ecclesiastical authority further than it ought to extend, it is necessary that he should give them kindly to understand the conduct they must observe, and in case they do not correct themselves, he will skilfully oppose their designs in a manner that no rupture nor partiality be apparent, and advise His Majesty of everything in order that he may apply a suitable remedy.
>
> The colony of Montreal, situated above that of Quebec, deriving great comfort and consolation from the ecclesiastics of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, who are settled there, it is necessary that Sieur de Frontenac afford them all the protection in his power, as well as to the Recollect Fathers, who have settled in the town of Quebec, it being necessary to support these two ecclesiastical bodies in order to counterbalance the authority the Jesuit Fathers might assume to the prejudice of that of His Majesty.[3]

Previous difficulties between Bishop Laval, supported by the Jesuits, and the Sulpicians had led Colbert to hope for support for Frontenac from the priests of Montreal. But the Perrot affair, and Frontenac's high-handed treatment of Fénelon, caused the Sulpicians to hold aloof from the governor.

That Colbert over and above the official royal memoir gave Frontenac verbal instructions may be considered certain. In his letter of November 14, 1674, after charging Villeray and d'Auteuil with being two of his "enemies," and after having written in code that to admit these two men in the Council chamber was tantamount to admitting the Superior and the Minister of the Jesuit house at Quebec, the governor continued out of code:

> I am only speaking of this to comply with what you did me the honor of saying when I left, that His Majesty did not wish certain persons [namely, the Jesuits] to increase their authority. My sole zeal for the service of the king will always be my only

---

[3] Mémoire du roi servir d'instruction au Sieur de Frontenac, April 7, 1672, Clément, III^2, 537; RAPQ, 1927, 5-6, translation from NYCD, IX, 88.

rule of conduct, no matter how many enemies I may thereby make for myself.[4]

Frontenac followed the verbal instructions he got from Colbert. He was supposed to seek out any Jesuit encroachment upon the sacrosanct royal authority, and the old courtier could be expected to find it. Talon had also received instructions about the too great authority the Jesuits had acquired in Canada.[5] These instructions he annotated thus:

> The short time I have been in Canada has not yet enabled me to acquire a perfect knowledge of the conduct of the Jesuits in the past, but having closely observed whether now they are making use of the spiritual authority to weaken the temporal authority. . . . I have recognized that they remain within the limits of their profession, and until now, they have not seemed eager to meddle with the affairs of the state.[6]

The comparison between the first letter of the intendant and the first letter of the governor, as given below, is illuminating. Both had instructions with regard to the Jesuits, both had been a short time in Canada, both wrote to the man who had given the instructions, but the intendant was more accurate than the governor. Frontenac landed in Quebec late in the summer of 1672. The transmission of powers took place September 12.[7] In less than two months,[8] he had seen all, heard all, knew all—that is, all necessary for composing a report with such findings as Colbert might expect of him. The passage about the Jesuits in his first letter to Colbert, dated November 2, 1672, has long been published in English. The editor prefaced it with the following title: "A Passage the great portion of which is in Cipher, wherein M. de Frontenac communicates to the Minister what he has done to keep in check the ever active ambition of the Jesuits."[9]

---

[4] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, AC, C 11A,4:68, RAPQ, 1927, 65.

[5] Mémoire pour servir d'instruction à Talon, March 27, 1665, AC, B 1, 76 ff., AE, Mém. et Doc., *Amérique,* 5:146 ff., Clément, III^2, 389, RAPQ, 1931, 5 ff., NYCD, IX, 24 ff.

[6] Mémoire du roi pour servir d'instruction à Talon, avec notes de Talon, October 1665, RAPQ, 1931, 11; cf. the intendant's letter to Colbert, AC, C 11A,2:143, RAPQ, 1931, 32, translated in NYCD, IX, 29.

[7] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 689.

[8] "I haven't had time to visit much of the country, and the longest journey I made has been to the Island of Orleans. I have seen the banks of Beaupré and Beauport, those of the St. Lawrence on my way down to Three Rivers, whither I hurried on hearing a report, which proved to be false, that the Iroquois had made an incursion on the Sokokis," Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, AC, C 11A, 3:236, RAPQ, 1927, 12-13.

> I send you under letter G, copy of the passport in which, you will perceive, I obliged Father Crespieu [de Crespieul], Jesuit, to have his name inserted. They were not in the habit of doing this, and passed and repassed into all the different countries, and even to France, without any passports or permits. But I have let the Father Superior adroitly and civilly know that such freedom was not in order, and that they ought to be the first to show the example of submission; he forthwith sent Father Crespieu to me. *I believe you will approve that I acted thus with them and that it is well to prevent them arrogating special privileges to themselves.* I expressed forcibly to them my astonishment at seeing that, of all the Indians that are with them at Notre-Dame de Foy, which is only a league and a half from Quebec, not one spoke French, though associating with us, and told them that they ought, in their missions, bethink themselves, when rendering the savages subjects to Jesus Christ, of making them subjects of the King also; that for that purpose it would be necessary to inspire them with a desire to learn our language, as the English taught them theirs; to endeavor to render them more sedentary, and make them abandon a life so opposed to the spirit of Christianity, and that the true means to render them Christians was to make them become men. *But whatever pretence they manifest, they will not listen to that language, and to speak frankly to you, they think as much about the conversion of the beaver as of souls; for the majority of their missions are pure mockeries, and I should not think they ought to be permitted to extend them further until we see somewhere a better organized church of those savages.* I strongly exhorted the Gentlemen of *the Seminary of Montreal to follow such a policy at Kenté, and to inspire their savages with those sentiments which they promised they would do. This perhaps will excite the others through jealousy to do the same.*
>
> *If you will hint as much also to Father Ferrier, perhaps what he may write would produce some effect. Another thing*

---

[9] NYCD, IX, 93.

> *that displeases me is the complete subserviency of the Priests of the Seminary of Quebec and the Bishop's Vicar-general to the Jesuit Fathers, without whose orders they do not the least thing. Thus they are indirectly masters of whatever relates to the Spiritual, which, as you are aware, is a great machine to move all the rest. They have, if I mistake not, gained over even the Superior of the Recollects, who has no more than three or four Friars in his Monastery, which the Jesuit Fathers would be very glad to see entirely abolished, and where it would be necessary to have clever Friars of sufficient talent to balance somewhat that of the others. You will bear in mind, if you deem fit, to say something about it to the Bishop of Quebec and to the Provincial of the Recollects.*
>
> I have personally every reason in the world to be pleased with the civility and urbanity of the Reverend Jesuit Fathers. . . .[10]

Several statements in this quotation will be examined hereafter. Later in the same letter, after having told Colbert that Villeray had been expelled from the Council for being a mischiefmaker, Frontenac adds:

> Still another, a much stronger reason for his expulsion is that *he is entirely devoted to the Jesuit Fathers,* and it is even commonly said here that he *is one of those who without wearing the garb have nevertheless taken the vows.* This is why I thought it my duty to notify you, should they speak to you about it, so you may see whether after having had so much trouble to withhold *from the Jesuit Fathers the knowledge and direction of the affairs in this country, it would be fitting to open them a door through which they might enter indirectly.*[11]

Thus, Frontenac prepared the way as far as Colbert was concerned for a series of arbitrary measures, and thus he cloaked his desire for supremacy in the guise of an earnest to protect the king's authority. Unable to take over the spiritual power of the Jesuits, he undermined their reputation with the Court, criticized them and their missions as useless along cultural and spiritual lines. Unable to remove them from Canada, he attacked the missionaries through men devoted to them, and even sought to bring dissensions and jealousy into the ecclesiastical ranks. Colbert answered:

---

[10] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, AC, C 11A,3:246v-248; RAPQ, 1927, 20-21; the translation taken from NYCD, IX, 93-94, has been revised. The passages in italics are in cipher.

[11] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, AC, C 11A,3:249v-250; RAPQ, 1927, 21.

> A week ago, the Provincial of the Recollects despatched two of his subjects. They will embark for Canada and betake themselves to their convent there. With a view to the continued increase of their number, I had the same Provincial informed today to send two more [chosen from among] the most determined [*des plus forts*]. I shall even take care that he send some each year in order thereby to counterbalance the too great authority the Jesuits have assumed in that country.[12]

The possibility mentioned by the king that the Jesuits might assume a too great authority had now, thanks to the letters to Frontenac, become a reality with Colbert. Whether the minister actually believed what the governor had written, or whether he merely acted as if he believed it, is beside the point. To Frontenac it was all one. When he received the letter of Colbert which was a virtual approval of his policy, and when he saw how well his story was taken by the statesman in Paris, he proceeded to improve on his first letter. The two Recollects arrived in 1673. He ventured the following points: They "seem to me to have much merit"; but "two are not enough"; "half a dozen" should be sent in 1674. The priests of the Seminary and the Jesuits are too closely united; in fact, the former are Jesuits, for they are all members of the sodality of Father Bagot, and "hence have taken the same vows as the others." The only difference between them is that the one group wears linen collars, and the other, the Jesuits, does not. All of which is very deplorable, "because the episcopal authority which could check or at least counterbalance that which the Jesuit Fathers have usurped, helps them on the contrary to maintain their authority and even to increase it every day." The minister should expostulate with the bishop who was then in France; and should the see become vacant, the bishopric should not be entrusted "to one who is in so great a dependence on the Jesuits as it is said this one is." The Jesuits are much too inquisitive. Their curiosity "is so great in the confessional that they greatly torment [*gehennent*] consciences. They are not satisfied with knowing the nature of the offences committed, but they also want to know the names of the accomplices, and a thousand other circumstances which do not belong to the essence of confession." Worse still, after having learned such particulars they inform "the husband of the conduct of his wife or the mother of that of her daughter; if they do not do it themselves, they send the information through their emissaries." All of this is the cause of much turmoil.

---

[12] Colbert to Frontenac, June 13, 1673, Clément III2, 559; RAPQ, 1927, 25, translation taken from NYCD, IX, 95, revised.

This odious accusation that the Jesuits in Canada were violating the sacramental seal gives the measure of Sieur de Frontenac's respect for truth. Well did Louis de Buade know that it was a diabolical accusation; he did not trouble to put the calumny into code.

> Indeed, my Lord, I recall every day to my mind the last words you spoke to me when I took leave of you, and I realize more and more that it is very expedient for the service of the king to oppose the least encroachments made on his authority, which are daily occurrences here, and if I were not firm in this respect, this authority would be altogether lost, as there is nothing here at which they aim more eagerly than to lessen that authority. Nevertheless to thwart such schemes, I only make use of the most skillful and gentle means I can devise, according to what you prescribed I should do. I had to remember your orders when this winter a Jesuit Father purposely and needlessly preached a sermon to which a week beforehand he had invited everybody to be present.

The sermon, Frontenac goes on to explain, dealt with the brandy trade. It contained terms injurious to royal authority. He went to see the superior and demanded an apology. Everything was quiet at the time of writing, but "their intention to persuade the people that their authority must be respected before all others even in secular matters [that is, with regard to the brandy trade] is clearly perceived." Since the Canadians had little or no perspicacity, it was necessary for him, Frontenac, to be constantly watching. He often warned the Jesuits that he would be sorry to find himself obliged to write to Colbert about their ambition. He begged the Minister to keep this all a deep secret.

> The Superior of the Jesuits [Dablon] is a wise and prudent man who will not cause any trouble, but there are certain community interests which he cannot forsake, for the protection of which he is bound to act; but always secretly and without seeming to defend these interests. We are getting along fine, he and I, and outside this sort of affair, I pay him, as well as the ecclesiastics of the Seminary, all kinds of regards. I do them all possible favors, and until now there is nothing which he [Dablon] asked me that I did not grant him.[13]

These are only a few items of the long letter. Frontenac had found his stride, but Colbert had not time to read such voluminous epistles. It was the custom to make extracts for his use, and hence four items were selected by the clerk, who made a synopsis of this letter: Frontenac's request for six Recollects; his complaint that a too great union existed between the Bishop, the priests of the Seminary, and the Jesuits, as well as the tormenting of the consciences of the people; the sermon of the Jesuit in Quebec; the reservation of the sin of those who sell brandy.[14]

Colbert in his answer promised to complete the "half-dozen" Recollects by ordering the Provincial to send four more, but the fervor of Sieur de Frontenac was somewhat damped when the minister wrote that "His Majesty does not think that these good Fathers [Jesuits] should be hampered in their functions."[15] Colbert had expected Frontenac to carry out his verbal instructions as he himself would have done had he been in Canada,—if the Jesuits had effectively encroached upon the king's authority. But Frontenac, for all his vaunted bluntness, was a born courtier. He knew from the verbal instructions what the minister wanted to hear, and he said it. Answering the letter of Colbert, he wrote:

> As I have always intended to follow exactly what you prescribed for me to do when I left with regard to 211 [Laval] and the

---

[13] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 31 ff.

[14] AC, C 11A, 4:25.

[15] Colbert to Frontenac, May 17, 1674, Clément, III^2, 572; RAPQ, 1927, 57.

> 212 [Jesuits] I thought I should not allow them to gain authority by means of their emissaries, of whom this one [Villeray] is the principal and the most dangerous.[16]

The governor's petty tyranny with regard to the Jesuits was viewed with disfavor by the king, and soon by the minister also. Frontenac was endeavoring to justify his stand by saying that he really opposed the Jesuits only in so far as they encroached upon the king's authority. He had sacrificed truth to a desire to profit by the good graces of Colbert and, supposing Colbert would follow a course of action against the Jesuits, which Frontenac's accusation demanded, he would have their influence cut to a minimum, and his power would thereby be enhanced and even supreme in the colony. The king did not take to the program, and hence Frontenac reiterated his statement that he was only doing as Colbert had instructed. He had evidently considered himself partner with Colbert in a great game of Jesuit-baiting. He was quite aware of what the outcome would be if his secret mendacious letters were communicated to either the Jesuits or the Bishop, and hence his plea to Colbert for profound secrecy.[17] Why, it may be asked, were not the accusations referred to the accused? M. Dudouyt, Vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec in Paris, believed it was because

> they were full of exaggerated calumnies, which would have compelled many things to be said. Part of them has been communicated to M. Richez, whose memorials were sent to M. Duchesneau. It will be well for you to see them. Madame de Frontenac has made earnest petitions and M. Barrois has not lost time in maintaining the sentiments of his master [Frontenac]. What is more surprising is that use is made of lies as of truth, after the said Sieur had made St. Aubin say all that he is retailing. He has been much annoyed that I had been informed of all the

---

[16] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, AC, C 11A,4:65, RAPQ, 1927, 63.

[17] Speaking of the end of the ciphered passage in the letter of November 2, 1672, the editor of NYCD, IX, 94, aptly notes: "Here the ciphers terminate, and in case persons in the interest of the Jesuits should read the memoir, M. de Frontenac, to conceal his game, continues the letter: 'I have personally every reason to be pleased with the civility and urbanity of the Reverend Jesuit Fathers. . . .'"

said St. Aubin had been saying, that was, he said, to ruin him.[18]

Either those accusations were true or they were false. If they were true, four conclusions follow: (1) Proof could have been given on one point alone, *e. g.,* the violation of the seal of confession, and this would have effectively rid him and the country of Jesuit influence. (2) Colbert assuredly would have backed him. (3) The king would have acted against the Jesuits. The fact that he did not and that Colbert did not is indication of the value they put on the statements. (4) If true, Frontenac could have come forth boldly with his accusations, rather than in the covert manner of secret letters and codes. If they were false Frontenac takes front rank as a calumniator. His explanation that he was acting for the good of the king is no valid excuse. Might not the code accusations have been made rather, as Rochemonteix very well saw, because the influence of the Jesuits "hurt the self-love of the high and mighty Lord?"[19]

The king was much more definite than Colbert had been. He was more concerned in upholding his authority than either Colbert or Frontenac. But Louis XIV was not afflicted with as morbid a fear of encroachments as his minister was. He knew that his subjects in Canada, and above all the missionaries, were obedient and eager to defend his authority and to submit to his orders. The king blamed the arbitrary acts of the governor, and cautioned him against meddling in ecclesiastical affairs, which was the only real encroachment that had taken place, or troubling the priests and the missionaries in their functions. Although the monarch did not believe everything which had come to his knowledge with regard to Frontenac's meddlesomeness,

> I deem it, however, for the good of my service that you correct yourself, if such instances of interference are true. But what you are hereby ordered to do is not to mention to anybody that I have written to you about it, even should the Bishop and the ecclesiastics make mention of it. I also order you not to harbor any resentment against them, and this is so important that it

---

[18] Dudouyt to Laval, 1677, *Report on the Canadian Archives, for 1885,* cxxi.

[19] Rochemonteiux, III, 122.

> would be impossible that my service should not suffer very prejudicial harm, were you to act otherwise.[20]

Complaints had been made that Frontenac had not allowed the vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec to attend the sessions of the Sovereign Council, which was a formal violation of the edict of creation,[21] a real encroachment on the king's authority on the part of Frontenac; that he demanded the missionaries and priests going from one village to another to secure passports from him; that he intercepted their letters; etc. "If all this is true," wrote the king—and we may add that it was true—"you must correct these faults." The missionaries have the right to go anywhere they want in Canada without passports from the governor, Louis XIV reasserted. Frontenac is forbidden to tamper with their mail; and in the absence of Laval the vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec, M. de Bernières, has the right to attend the sessions of the Sovereign Council.

The King also viewed differently from Colbert the sending of the "determined" Recollects. He told Frontenac that he was having five Recollects[22] sent to Canada,

> intending by this means to give a greater freedom to the consciences than they have had until now. But although this is my intention you must not meddle with anything that belongs to the consciences, or with the conduct of the Bishop, priests, Jesuits or Recollects, except gently and by exhortations, endeavoring as much as you can to lessen the too great authority which those ecclesiastics had by such means acquired in perhaps hampering a little too much the consciences of the people.[23]

The letters Frontenac sent in 1676 do not seem to be extant; their contents however can be partially deduced from the answer of the king dated April 28, 1677. The governor is told that two more Recollects are being sent to Canada, and the recommendation is added that Frontenac protect them. The governor had also written that the clergy "continued to carry on peltry trade with the Indians." He was ordered to put a stop to it, and if necessary to make use of the king's authority.[24] This accusation which does not deal specifically with the Jesuits, however, is met with for the first time from Frontenac. It also appears from the king's answer that Frontenac had complained that Duchesneau followed too easily the lead of the clergy. Indeed, until both the governor and the intendant were recalled in 1682, there is not very much change in Frontenac's correspondence in this respect. Before the arrival of the intendant the most prominent subject for complaints on the part of the governor was Villeray. During the six remaining years, what he had written about Villeray before the coming of Duchesneau is repeated *ad nauseam* about the intendant. But there is one noticeable change in Frontenac's letters to Louis XIV and Colbert after 1677. The Jesuits who figured so prominently in the first letters well-nigh disappear from his correspondence after this date. There are only a few occasional indirect references and one direct to the missionaries. If we had only these and only his letters, it would be hard to deduce that the Jesuits were still in New France.

---

[20] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 82.

[21] *Edits,* I, 38.

[22] Commenting on the groups of Recollects sent year after year, Rochemonteix, III, 124, wrote: "One is tempted to smile, after two centuries, at such successive re-inforcements sent against the missionaries of the Society of Jesus. In our days what government would find among the members of Religious Orders volunteers as obliging as the Recollects of those days? These indeed, fulfilled their contract exceedingly well, as is proved by their correspondence and their books." Cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 321-322. If we should believe La Tour, they had come to Canda "pour se battre contre le clergé," *Mémoires sur la vie de Mgr de Laval premier évêque de Quebec,* Cologne, 1761, 210.

[23] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 82.

Frontenac's correspondence was not restricted to Louis XIV and Colbert. He speaks of the Jesuits, in the letter seemingly addressed to his friend and protector, Bernardin Gigault, Marquis de Bellefonds.[25] As already noted, the governor asserted that he was not the cause of the divisions existing in the colony; Colbert, he said, is misinformed. Soon the minister will learn from other reports that Frontenac has contributed least to these dissensions. "I shall have no more troubles either with the intendant, with the bishop, or with the Jesuits, and I believe that the last named will testify to you that I made no difficulty about ratifying [the land grant] which you were kind enough to promise them in my name." Frontenac here refers to a grant near Montreal, the Sault Saint Louis. He held out five years before transferring the property to the Jesuits for the Indians, because his protégé, La Salle, wanted it for his commerce. To be valid the title had to be ratified by the governor and Duchesneau, "who, you easily understand, made no difficulty" about signing the deed.[26] Long before this date, 1680, Frontenac had stopped sending his misrepresentations and accusations in code or in clear against the Jesuits.

---

[24] *Id.* to *id.*, April 28, 1677, RAPQ, 1927, 89-91. Colbert in a letter dated Sceaux, May 10, 1677, Clément, III^2, 622-624, but dated May 18 in RAPQ, 1927, 91-93, substantially repeats what the king had written.

[25] *Mémoires de Saint-Simon,* VI, 166, n. 4.

When Frontenac wrote this letter to de Bellefonds, he had received that of the king of April 29, 1680. The governor saw the handwriting on the wall. The letters he sent to Paris until his recall contain little else than a lengthy apology for his conduct, interminable explanations concerning the perverseness of Duchesneau, of d'Auteuil, the members of the Council, and nearly everybody, except the Jesuits.[27] The meeting which he convened at the Jesuit house, March 23, 1682, might be looked upon as an indication that the relations between Frontenac and the Jesuits had vastly improved toward the end of the governor's first term.[28] There was no reason why Frontenac and the Jesuits should not have worked in harmony from the beginning. Father de Lamberville took a charitable view of the attitude too long adopted by the governor toward his brethren. "Surely," he wrote, "some person has slandered us to you on two or three occasions." If Frontenac had and still has at heart the good of Canada, said the missionary, the Jesuits had never any other thought than that of helping him. However, he tactfully added, "the past is past, and I do not think that you ever set great store on the insufficiently grounded accusing reports which were made to you.[29]

---

[26] Frontenac to [Marshall Bellefonds], November 14, 1680, AC, C 11A, 5:158v, RAPQ, 1927, 118. Cf. *Relations inédites,* II, 66-67.

[27] Cf. AC, C 11A, 5:266-275v, 280-282, 382-391, etc., in RAPQ, 1927, 118-119, 131-138, 139, etc.

[28] NYCD, IX, 168-173, *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections,* 34, 277-280. Cf. Lorin, 241.

[29] Lamberville to Frontenac, September 20, 1682, AC C 11A, 6:48; NYCD, IX, 193.

THE FRENCHIFICATION SCHEME

THE FRENCHIFICATION SCHEME

SECTION 1. BEFORE FRONTENAC

As has been said previously, after 1677 there are but few indirect references to the Jesuits in Frontenac's letters. There is one direct reference in which he alludes to an earlier clash between the governor and the missionaries over the matter of the frenchification of the Indians. The Jesuits were not opposed to the scheme in the abstract, but an experience of two score years had taught them its hopelessness. The bureaucrats in France saw nothing but benefits to come from this system, for if the Indians were only taught the French language, everything else would follow, French civilization, French customs, French manners. While it would be rash to deny the influence of the language spoken on the civilization attainable, it would be no less rash to consider the mere knowledge and use of the language as the sole means whereby men could be reclaimed from barbarism. Nothwithstanding the insinuations of Le Clercq or of his editor, the Jesuits had earnestly tried the scheme which to him appeared as the panacea for all evils colonial.

In his Relation of 1635, Father Le Jeune stated his three great designs: to found a college for the French in Quebec, to help the missionaries among the Hurons, and to "establish a seminary for the Indian children to rear them in the Christian faith."[1] This idea was not new. The Recollects in 1615 founded a seminary for native children and actually began it, but they were forced to give up for lack of funds.[2] They had met with just as little success with the idea as the Jesuits did later, and for exactly the same reason—the Indian character. Le Clercq wrote: "Our Fathers, who had then all power and credit in the missions, did not despair of succeeding in time in civilizing some of these Indians. Their project would doubtless have had all the success they expected, but they passionately desired to raise some and instruct them sufficiently in the Faith to enable them to receive our holy habit, hoping by this means to attract other Indians to come to us and receive our instructions more joyfully when they saw some of their nation, clothed like us, explaining our mysteries to them."[3] Here and elsewhere in his *First Establishment of the Faith,* Le Clercq puts the blame for the failure of frenchification and all the other evils flowing therefrom at the door of the Jesuits. When the Recollects returned to Canada, befriended by Talon and Frontenac, they succeeded no better in frenchifying the Indians than their brethren had in 1615, or the Jesuits in 1636.

---

[1] R. G. Thwaites, *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents,* Cleveland, 1896-1901, 7, 265, hereinafter to be cited as *Jesuit Relations.*

[2] C. Le Clercq, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France,* Shea's translation, New York, 1881, I, 144, 251, hereinafter quoted as Le Clercq. Cf. Gosselin, *Vie de Mgr de Laval,* Quebec, 1890, I, 558.

Father Le Jeune having espoused the idea of beginning a seminary for Indians[4] was feeling his way, as is evident from his hesitations and his change of plans. At first he thought of taking in Huron Indians only;[5] later he was inclined to admit Montagnais Indians as well.[6] In 1634, he considered sending the children to France to be educated in the mother country; but he feared that the parents' love for their children would prove a most serious, a well nigh insuperable obstacle. This difficulty, he wrote in 1636, would be lessened, if there were a seminary in Canada. The next problem was to find a location for the school. In 1635, he thought of having it at the Jesuit residence of Our Lady of the Angels,[7] near Quebec, where the Recollects formerly had had their convent. Full of sanguine hope, he had become confident that it would be easier to sway parents to entrust their children to the missionaries if they were to remain in New France. And the next year, 1636, he had determined to mix the young Indians with the French children. He wrote in his relation of that year:

> Our great difficulty is to get a building, and to find the means with which to support these children. It is true, we are able to

---

[3] Le Clercq, I, 189, cf. 176, 254.

[4] *Jesuit Relations,* 6, 150.

[5] *Ibid.,* 9, 104.

[6] *Ibid.,* 9, 106.

[7] *Ibid.,* 7, 264; cf. the two articles of N. E. Dionne, "Le Séminaire de Notre-Dame-des-Anges," *Revue Canadienne,* Troisième Série, III, 1890, 65-81, 148-166.

> maintain them at Notre Dame des Anges, but as this place is isolated, so that there are no French children there, we have changed the plan that we formerly had to place the Seminary there. Experience shows us that it must be established where the bulk of the French population is, to attract the little Savages by means of the French children.[8]

But if there were advantages in mixing French and Indian children, there were also inconveniences. It was finally decided to open the school at Our Lady of the Angels, as had been first intended. Once the school was ready, the question was to fill it with pupils. The Jesuit missionaries among the Hurons after many entreaties had prevailed upon the parents of twelve young Indians to send them to Quebec, but when the time to part came

> the mothers, and above all the grandmothers, would not allow their children to go away for a distance of three hundred leagues, and to live with strangers, quite different from them and their habits and customs. Some embarked, however; but, when they arrived, the fathers of these children drew back and sought a thousand excuses. Poor Father Daniel went hither and thither, coaxed some, made presents to others, and yet after all he saw himself almost a master without pupils, a shepherd without sheep. A single young man, grandson of a Captain, remained steadfast, never yielding to his determination to follow him.[9]

A council was held. By presents, by cajolery, by taunting the Indians for their lack of courage, the missionaries persuaded two more to go. A few days later, Nicolet brought three more Indians to the Seminary.[10] In the elation of having at last started a work which he had so much at heart, whose beginnings had given so much trouble, we can almost hear Le Jeune's sigh of relief in the following paragraph:

> So now, by the Grace of God we have begun a Huron Seminary. If you like you can have two more; another one for the Huron

---

[8] *Jesuit Relations,* 9, 104-106; cf. *ibid.,* 12, 38 ff., where Father Le Jeune gives a summary of what he had written in the Relations of the preceding years. Charlevoix, P. F. X., *History and General Description of New France,* Shea's translation, 6 vols., New York, 1866-1872, II, 91-92, to be quoted as Charlevoix.

[9] *Jesuit Relations,* 9, 284.

[10] *Ibid.,* 9, 298.

> and other neighboring tribes in the same territory as the Hurons, where more than five hundred children could be educated if we had people and means enough. The third will be among the Montagnais; I have already said that nothing more is wanting now but a place to lodge and maintain the children.[11]

The future which appeared so bright to Father Le Jeune had in store many a heartbreaking disappointment. Two of the more promising candidates died the following year;[12] one of the first three recruits became homesick and returned.[13] More Indians came at the end of 1636 and in 1637,[14] but they ran away in the spring of 1638.[15] In 1639 Montagnais, Algonquins, and Hurons were admitted, but disease and death soon thinned their ranks. Le Jeune now wrote:

> These casualties made us resolve to keep with us only the five or six younger boys, who also have been attacked by catarrh and colds, so difficult is it to make these poor Seminarists exist out of the homes or cabins of their kindred. The Devil sees clearly the fruit that may be expected from them, hence he employs all the resources of his malice to overthrow this holy enterprise; he will only lose therein his own labor.[16]

Father Le Jeune's hopes were still to sanguine. He had begun to hint at the real difficulty, at the crux of the matter. It consisted in the atavism of the North American Indians; centuries of a mode of life had developed racial characteristics which had become part and parcel of their physical, intellectual, and cultural make-up. In 1643 the experiment had come to an end. Father Vimont wrote in the Relation of that year:

> The Seminary of the Hurons, which had been established at Notre Dame des Anges some years ago, in order to educate children of that nation, was interrupted for good reasons, and especially because no notable fruit was seen among the Savages; our experience in beginning the instruction of a people with the

---

[11] *Ibid.,* 9, 284.
[12] *Ibid.,* 12, 48.
[13] *Ibid.,* 12, 44.
[14] *Ibid.,* 12, 42.
[15] *Ibid.,* 14, 242.
[16] *Ibid.,* 16, 187.

> children has made up recognize this fact. Here is an occasion which has obliged us to reestablish a Seminary in a new but easier fashion, as it were, and in behalf of persons, older, and more capable of instruction. God grant that the incursions of the Iroquois may not hinder us from continuing.[17]

The new model seminary was at the settlement at Sillery. The attempt at founding a seminary for young Indians had lasted more than five years when the Jesuits abandoned it. It was a notable failure. The cause of this failure is to be sought in the innate racial characteristics of the Indians then insufficiently known to the missionaries. The young Indians after the novelty had worn out regretted their lost freedom, the hunt, the vagabond life in the forest. Nearly all became hopelessly homesick. "Hunting and the woodland air attracted them, so that it was difficult to keep them," wrote Le Clercq in an unguarded moment,[18] but apparently lest this admission exonerate the Jesuits with whose methods he can only find fault, he immediately adds:

> It is true that, had what was then sketched out been continued till now, success would have followed, and these Indian nations would perhaps be civilized, as we see that among our neighbors of New England and New Netherland our Europeans, though heretics, but wiser than we in this have drawn among them various Indian tribes, who have so far adopted their customs that they are brought up to all kinds of trades and professions, a great many being well-instructed Christians. Some even serve as ministers for the instruction of others, although these heretics began the work after us. So that we may well fear that God will one day reproach the French on this point, that the children of darkness are more prudent in the propagation of error than the children of light in the true conversion of souls.[19]

The numerous conversions of Indians in New Netherland, as well as their knowledge of English and their skill in all the civilized arts, were to appear later in Cadillac's romantic accounts written at about the time Le Clercq published his book. The passage, breathing piety, and warning of the judgment of God, contains much misinformation and more misunderstanding of the situation. The Jesuits—for it seems clear they were meant by the French in the above quotation—who lived in daily expectation of the judgment of God and who beheld at times companion missionaries being despatched by tomahawks, closed the seminary only after trial, and only when convinced of the utter futility of their efforts with the Indian youths. Moreover, even without Le Clercq's suggestion about the reproach of God, they considered themselves bound in justice to put to a better use the money their brethren were begging in France for the support of the seminary by spending it to build huts for the grown-up Indians who had come to settle near Sillery.[20]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, 24, 102.

[18] Le Clercq, I, 188; *Lettres de la Venerable Mere Marie de l'Incarnation premiere Superieure des Ursulines de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, 1681, 627, 633, hereinafter quoted as Mary of the Incarnation; E. M. Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie Française en Canada,* Villemarie, 1866, III, 277, hereinafter quoted as Faillon.

[19] Le Clercq, I, 188-189.

The seminary experiment just recounted was an honest one. Its failure was frankly admitted by the Jesuits. Years later the anti-Jesuit party in France began to circulate the rumor that the Jesuits were opposed to the frenchification of the Indians. They alleged as the reason for this opposition that if the Indians were to speak French, the Jesuits' influence with them would come to an end. Colbert was won over by the arguments of the theorists in France who, far away from the haunts of the tractable savages, were the colony constructionists, "colonizing" New France from the *salons* in Paris. The minister in this case was swayed by his craving for centralization and unification.

Shortly after his arrival in Canada, Talon, acting on Colbert's instructions, drafted a police regulation for the Algonquins and the Hurons, but the intendant wrote to the minister: "I have met with obstacles which I shall endeavor to remove. It is true that they should have been taught our language long ago, so as not to force the king's subjects to learn theirs when they wish to communicate with them."[21]

---

[20] *Jesuit Relations,* 18, 78.

[21] Talon to Colbert, November 13, 1666, AC, C 11A, 2:222; RAPQ, 1931, 58. Cf. the declaration of M. Souart, October 7, 1667, AC, F 3, 3:353, where it is said that for the French to have to learn the language of the Indians "blessoit la dignité de leur nation." On the other hand, the Indians, wrote Kalm a century later, *Peter*

To which Colbert answered:

> I confess that I agree with you that up to the present time in New France very little regard has been paid to the police and civilization of the Algonquins and Hurons, who were a long time ago subjected to the king's domination. Little effort has been made to detach them from their savage customs and to oblige them to adopt ours, especially to teach them our language; instead, to carry on some traffic with them, our French have been obliged to learn theirs. You have begun to remedy this long negligence, and you must endeavor to attract these people, especially those who have embraced Christianity, to the vicinity of our settlements, and if possible to mix them with the French, in order that, in the course of time, having but one law and one master, they may likewise constitute one people and one race.[22]

From a letter of Talon to Colbert we learn who was responsible for this long negligence. Shortly after his arrival, he wrote to the minister, and reproached the Jesuits "for not having applied themselves until now as they should have to civilizing the Indians and improving their manners. They promised that they would endeavor to change these barbarians in all their missions, beginning with the language."[23]

In 1668, Colbert advocated the founding of a seminary for young Indian children, along the same lines as that founded by Father La Jeune more than thirty years before. Paramount in the thoughts of the minister was the increase of the population of Canada without depopulating France, where men were needed for the wars of Louis XIV. Meas-

---

Kalm's Travels in North America, A. B. Benson ed., New York, 1937, II, 526, were "too proud to learn French." They looked upon all occupations except war and hunt as "low and unworthy of them," Mary of the Incarnation, 633.

[22] Colbert to Talon, April 5, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:297; RAPQ, 1931, 72, translation from NYCD, IX, 59, revised. When an Iroquois embassy came to Quebec in 1668, a Christian Huron harangued the Iroquois telling them that the French did not want to consider them as slaves, "mais que l'Onontio d'ici, qui est Monsieur le Gouverneur, & le Grand Onontio de France, qui est le Roy, vouloient que leurs enfans & ceux des François s'alliassent ensemble, afin de ne faire qu'un mème peuple. Il fit cette proposition sur ce qu'il a apris que Sa Majesté veut, à ce que l'on dit, que les Reverends Peres élevent un nombre de petits garçcons Sauvages & nous un nombre de petites filles à la Françoise," Mary of the Incarnation, 626-627.

[23] Talon to Colbert, October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:317v; RAPQ, 1931, 84.

ures devised to increase the population of Canada were communicated to Talon, with orders for the intendant to enforce them. Among these measures were bounties for early and fruitful marriage of the whites,[24] fines for recalcitrant or inveterate bachelors, and urgent pleas to form settlements peopled with civilized Indians. The blame for the little progress made in this direction is laid at the door of "the Jesuit Fathers and to all those who have been in authority in the country." They have not favored marriages between Indians and whites; they have not admitted whole families of Indians in the French settlements; they have not

> formed them to abandon their idle and lazy form of life and till the land in the vicinity of the French settlements. They have not attracted the children, or secured the consent of their parents to rear them according to our customs and to teach them our language. I am surprised, I assure you, to have noticed thus far no inclination to a thing so necessary and which can contribute more than anything else to the increase of the population and make the colony numerous and flourishing. I entreat you to apply yourself earnestly to it during the short time you are to remain in the colony, and to urge the ecclesiastics, officers and officials, to apply themselves to it as a part of their duty and their most important occupation.[25]

Colbert was evidently unaware that the Jesuits of Canada, the superior of the mission not excepted, did not hesitate to till the soil with their own hands to give an example to the Indians. "Father Vimont, Superior of the mission," wrote Mother Mary of the Incarnation, "to encourage his poor Indians, leads them to work and works the soil with them."[26] Colbert was evidently unaware that long before his time, the Jesuits were strong advocates of marriages between reds and whites.[27] They defended such unions during the whole of the French régime. Long after his time they ran afoul of the government, when officialdom looked askance at such marriages; they were reproached because they preached the equality of French and Indians,[28] because they maintained "that there was no difference between Indian and White, when both were Christian."[29] Colbert was evidently not aware either of the experiment carried on by the Jesuits from 1636 to 1642. As has been aptly remarked: "A great deal of time, energy, and money might have been saved, had Colbert acquainted himself with the history of the question upon which his views were so pronounced.[30]

---

[24] Cf. *Edits,* I, 67-68, Clément, III^2, 657; for the difference in dates, cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 314, note 1.

[25] Colbert to Talon, February 20, 1668, AC, C 11A, 3:14v-15; RAPQ, 1931, 95.

[26] Mary of the Incarnation, 323.

[27] Cf. ASJ, Gal., 109, III, 356-357, the document is printed in *Nova Francia,* IV, 1929, 143-145.

In a letter written to Laval in 1668, the king expressed his surprise at the fewness of the Indians living among the French, and adopting their manner of life. Louis XIV hoped the bishop would urge those who henceforth were to labor for the conversion of the Indians to get them to change their form of life for that of the French and move into the French settlements,

> in order that they make only one people; because, if this were achieved, it would be easier, it seems, to make them embrace our religion. But in case too much difficulty be experienced in determining the parents to make such a change, at least all possible efforts should be made to oblige them to give up their children that they may be reared after the French manner and instructed in our religion.[31]

Colbert was much more emphatic in his letter to Laval written the same week: "I entreat you to apply yourself [to the frenchification scheme], so that your example may lead all the ecclesiastics and the heads of the more prominent families to devote themselves to it with all the warmth and devotion desirable for such an advantageous end."[32] Laval spared nothing to satisfy the wishes of the king.

---

[28] Cf. J. Delanglez, *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana, 1700-1763,* Washington and New Orleans, 1935, 392 ff.

[29] AC, C 13A, 15:167.

[30] M. Eastman, *Church and State in Early Canada,* Edinburgh, 1915, 114.

[31] Louis XIV to Laval, March 2, 1668, AE, Mém. et Doc., *Amérique,* 5:243.

[32] Colbert to Laval, March 7, 1668, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, n. 27, printed in Langevin, *Notice biographique sur François de Laval,* Montreal, 1874, 47-48.

> As the king has notified me of his desire for us to attempt to bring up the little Savage children after the French manner of life, in order to civilize them, little by little, I have formed a Seminary, into which I have taken a number of children for this express purpose. In order to succeed the better, I have been obliged to join with them some little French children, from whom, by living with them, the Savages will learn more easily the customs and the language. This enterprise is not without difficulty, on the part of both the children and the parents; the latter have an extraordinary love for their children, and can scarcely make up their mind to be separated from them. Or, if they do permit this, it is very difficult to effect a separation for any length of time, because ordinarily the families of the Savages do not have many children, as do those of our French people—in which there are generally, in this country, 8, 10, 12 and sometimes as many as 15 and 16 children. The Savages, on the contrary, have usually only two or three; and rarely do they exceed the number of four. As a result, they depend on their children, when they are somewhat advanced in years, for the support of their family. This can only be gained by the chase, and by other labors for which the parents are no longer fit when their children have the years and ability to help them; to do so at that time, the law of nature seems to constrain the children by necessity. Nevertheless, we shall spare no pains, on our part, to make this blessed undertaking succeed, although it seems to us very doubtful.[33]

In 1669 both the king and the minister had congratulated the bishop for the beginning he had made. Louis XIV said he realized how difficult the task would be to weld the two races into one people, and that success depended on the exertions of Laval, the Jesuits, and the Sulpicians. Through Talon, who was returning to Canada, the king was sending a gratuity to enable Laval to raise the Indian children.[34] The same encouragements are found in the official correspondence of the two following years.[35]

---

[33] *Jesuit Relations,* 52, 47; cf. Mary of the Incarnation, 630-633.

[34] Louis XIV to Laval, May 17, 1669, AC, B 1:133v-134; cf. Colbert to Laval, May 15, 1669, AC, B 1:144, printed in Clément, III^2, 451-452 and in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXVI, 1930, 176; Colbert to Courcelle, May 15, 1669, AC, B 1:141, printed in Clément, III^2, 449-451, and in BRH, XXXVI, 1930, 377-379.

[35] Louis XIV to Laval, April 10, 1670, AC, B 2:37; Colbert to *id.,* April 10, 1670, *ibid.,* 37v-38; *id.* to *id.,* AC, B 3:40-41.

Nevertheless, Laval failed, as the Jesuits had failed thirty years before. The six Hurons whom he supported in the seminary ran away one after the other. In 1673 there was not a single Indian left.[36]

In 1667 Talon had enlisted the Sulpicians as well as Laval in undertaking the education of the young Indians according to the French manner.[37] M. Souart, then superior of the Sulpicians of Montreal, pledged himself and his subordinates to turn Indians into Frenchmen "provided we be not crossed or disturbed in this work of charity by those who pretend to be the only ones to have the direction of the Indians."[38] The Sulpicians opened a school in 1668, for which M. de Queylus, who in the interval had become the superior, was congratulated by the minister.[39] In 1670, Talon in a memoir on Canada noted:

> I must not forget to acquaint you that the Abbé de Queylus applied himself zealously to the reorganization of his clergy, to the increase of the Montreal colony, and to providing subjects for the missions, who, by the discoveries they made, acquit themselves worthily and usefully for the king. He pushes his zeal further, by the care he takes to recover the Indian children who fall into the hands of the Iroquois, in order to bring them up—the boys in his Seminary, the girls among persons of the same sex who form at Montreal a sort of sodality to instruct youth in reading, writing and a little handiwork. . . . Four lines to M. de Queylus and his community indicating the pleasure with which the king learns from my despatches the zeal they evince for Christianity and his Majesty's services, would have a very good effect. . . .[40]
>
> I found greatly diminished, on my return [1670], the number of little Indians brought up by the Bishop of Quebec and the [Jesuit] Fathers;[41] but I must say their zeal for this charity

---

[36] Gosselin, I, 563.

[37] Talon to Colbert, October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:317v, RAPQ, 1931, 84.

[38] AC, F 3, 3:353.

[39] AC, B 1:145, printed in Bulletin des *Recherches Historiques*, XXXII, 1926, 148, and pertinent extracts in Faillon, III, 273.

[40] See the letter of Colbert to Queylus, March 10, 1671, AC, B 3:35, Clément, III^2, 452, note 1.

[41] It would have been fairer to tell the minister the reason for this diminution. It is unlikely that Talon did not know of the fearful small pox epidemic of 1669-1670, which "furiously desolated the colony," cf. Charlevoix, III, 153-154.

> revives, and that they will endeavor to find new subjects to rear them according to our manners, language and maxims. It would be well to encourage the disposition they evince for this work by two or three approbatory lines.[42]

In spite of all their good will, their zeal, their devotedness, this attempt of the Sulpicians did not meet with success, because "the character of these [Indian] children rendered inefficacious the care taken of their education."[43] If success did not meet these three different attempts by men who knew the Indians, by men whose influence with the Indians was a recognized fact, by capable men most anxious to succeed, it was because the difficulty resided not in those men but in the Indians themselves.[44]

What has been said thus far concerns the frenchification of the boys. It would seem that the schooling of the girls, who are as a rule more pliable, would meet with better success. When the news reached Quebec of the government's wish to have another attempt made, Mother Mary of the Incarnation wrote that she herself and the Ursulines of Quebec were ready to try once more to show their obedience toward His Majesty.

> It is, however, a very difficult, if not an impossible task to frenchify or to civilize them. We have had more experience than anybody else, and we have noticed that among one hundred of those who passed through our hands, we hardly succeeded in civilizing one. We find them docile and clever, but when we least expect it, they jump the wall and go to join their parents in the woods, where they find more pleasure than they do amid all the attrac-

---

[42] Memoir of Talon, November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:88-88v, RAPQ, 1931, 127-128, translation from NYCD, IX, 69. As was seen above, Colbert wrote to Laval as he had written to Queylus, but no letter to the Jesuits has been found, although "Les Reverends Peres en [Indian children] ont pris aussi en leur College de Quebec; tous sont vétus à la Françoise, & on leur apprend à lire & a écrire comme en France," Mary of the Incarnation, 631.

[43] Faillon, III, 277.

[44] Gosselin, I, 239. It seems unnecessary to discuss the arguments given in Lorin, 61-70, whose chauvinism is apparent. Then, too, they are based upon the assumptions that whatever Frontenac advocated must of necessity be right, and whatever others advocated differently from him was hopelessly wrong. A better understanding of the difficulties inherent to the frenchification of the Indians is evinced by Salone, *La Colonisation de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, [1905?], 195, 262 f.

tions of our French houses. Such is the Indian character. They will brook no restraint. If they are constrained, they become melancholic and ill. Moreover, the Indians have an extraordinary love for their children. When they learn that they are sad, they brush aside all other considerations to get them back, and we must return their children to them. We have had Huron, Algonquian, and Iroquois girls; the last are the prettiest and the most docile. I do not know whether they will be more capable of being civilized than the others, or whether they will keep up the French politeness in which we have brought them up. I do not expect it from them; for they are Savages, and that is enough [to cause us] not to hope for it.[45]

In another letter written to the superioress of the convent of St. Denis, a few weeks later, Mary of the Incarnation speaks in general of the Huron and Algonquian girls whom the nuns had frenchified. They had married Frenchmen. There was one girl prodigy; she could read and write Huron and French so well that one would never take her for an Indian. Talon was very delighted and had her write a few lines in those two languages. He would "take them to France as something extraordinary."[46] Mary of the Incarnation returned to the subject in a letter to her son in the same year. "I do not know how all this will end, for to be frank with you, it seems to me a very difficult task. We have been in this country so many years, and *we have not been able to frenchify more than seven or eight girls;* the others returned to their homes, where, however, they are leading very Christian lives." The reason for this, she said, was the attraction for them of life in the woods, and it was nothing short of miraculous to bring them to like, to prefer, and consequently to imitate the ways and manners of the French.[47]

Such was the result of all the work of the Ursulines with regard to the frenchification of the Indian girls in 1668. One spoke French and seven or eight had married Frenchmen. The fruits were rather meagre for thirty years of effort. Whether they were known in Paris has not been ascertained. Charlevoix says:

---

[45] Mary of the Incarnation, 627.
[46] *Ibid.,* 630.
[47] *Ibid.,* 633. Italics inserted.

> Nothing had been more impressed on M. Talon than the importance of inducing those religious [Jesuits] to instruct the Indian children in the French language, and accustom them to our mode of life.
>
> I have heretofore remarked that the missionaries themselves had entertained this idea several years before; and I add, that it was not so much the difficulties encountered in executing the project as the bad effects which they had perceived after the first attempts of this education, that had induced them to abandon it. They explained the result to M. Talon, when that magistrate communicated to them the orders of the council on the subject; but their representations were ill received, and ascribed to a desire of being sole masters of the Indians, and thereby rendering themselves always necessary.
>
> To show them that they were not, the intendant resolved to do without them in the matter, and applied to the Bishop of Petraea and the ecclesiastics of Montreal who promised to do what the court desired; but the fruitlessness of their efforts soon justified the missionaries, and the Marquis de Tracy, in the sequel, contributed not a little to dispel the prejudices against them, with which that minister [Colbert] had been imbued. He had heard the project in question spoken of when he was on the spot; he had comprehended as well as the Jesuits did how impracticable and dangerous it was. . . .[48]

If Colbert did not know of the meagre results when Talon was sent to Canada, he was aware of them when Frontenac was sent, yet he impresed upon the latter the same ideas as those given to Talon, stated above by Charlevoix. Neither the minister, nor the intendant, nor the governor saw any difficulties in the scheme of unification through language and customs by means of the education of the children of the Indians, because none of them knew the Indian character.[49]

---

[48] Charlevoix, III, 96-97.

[49] "Sans de demander si la matière est malléable, si nos procédés d'éducation auront enfin prise sur ces natures demeurées jusque-là réfractaires à toute discipline, on se persuade 'qu'il ne sera pas difficile, après leur conversion . . . de les réduire, petit à petit, à quitter la chasse et la pesche pour défricher,' " Salone, 195.

Section 2. During Frontenac's First Term

When Frontenac arrived, he was astonished, just as Talon had been a few years before, because none of the Indians of Sainte-Foy spoke French. He proposed to imitate the English in this respect.[1] To make Christians of the Indians, it was necessary to make men of them first. It is rather amusing to read of each of these gentlemen telling the bishop and the veteran missionaries how the salvation of the Indians could be best secured. We constantly read their declamations about the encroachments of the spiritual power over the temporal, yet it does not seem to have occurred to them, that they themselves were meddling with something altogether out of their sphere, and about which they knew little or nothing. Frontenac was coming to Canada with a system of education elaborated by theorists who, like himself before his arrival in Quebec, had never seen an Indian. To Colbert, the letter of the astonished Frontenac seemed to prove his theory: he answered the governor that it was one of his duties to increase the population of Canada by

> attracting the Indians into the society and manner of living of the French. It appears that until now the Jesuits have had maxims contrary to this policy, that the priests of the Seminary have not applied themselves to this task; as for the Recollects, they have as yet had no time to devote themselves to it. His

---

[1] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, AC, C 11A, 3:246v-247; RAPQ, 1927, 20. In his speech of October 23, 1672, Frontenac said that greater favors will be granted by the king, when Colbert, notified by the governor, will be able to tell His Majesty that the "religieux" [Jesuits] who are employed in the missions, apply themselves with more zeal than ever before to the conversion of the Indians "par des moyens quils nont pu peut etre encore pratiquer, a les rendre sujets de J. C. et du roy tout ensemble, et quil [Colbert] verra que dans la pratique et le comerce quils ont continuellement avec eux ils leurs inspirent lenvie *daprandre nostre langue et de quiter des moeurs, et une facon de vivre qui est aussy contraire et oposée a lesprit du cristianisme quelle lest au sentiment dune personne veritablement resonable.* ils doivent estres persuades quils recevront des nouvelles marques de protection, et des assistances toutes particulieres dans lexecution de leurs pieux dessains," AC, C 11A, 3:229-229v.—On anglicizing the Indians cf. J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley,* Redfield, 1852, 80, and Charlevoix, III, 97, n. 3. (The question of civilization and christianization of the Indians in New England and New Netherland, as well as the comparison with the results obtained in New France is to be discussed in a subsequent study).

Majesty demands that you strongly apply yourself to change this attitude and, through emulation, to urge them all to action in this respect. The love of freedom of the Indians must be transformed into that of humanity, and [they must be led to] live in society, which is natural to man. To this effect, His Majesty would deem it most proper for each of these communities to take a certain number of Indian children who would be brought up in the knowledge of our Religion, and who in time should become good inhabitants.[2]

Colbert, be it said to his credit, considered the Indians as human beings, intelligent and capable of living according to the social customs of the French. Still, he did not consider them as "living in society." He supposed them to be in an unnatural state, a primitive outcast existence, as described by Aristotle. Other forms of society and social life different from what he was accustomed to at Versailles did not strike him as possible. Yet the Indians had a social organization, less formal and less complicated but just as real as that of the French, and just as vital to their existence.[3] To elevate the natives in their own society was quite different from changing their nature completely.

In spite of the assertions of Colbert, the Sulpicians and Laval had applied themselves to the frenchification of the Indians, had founded a seminary, had mixed the young Indians with the French boys; and the apparently contrary policy of the Jesuits at this date grew out of their experiences and frustrated plans.

After his journey to Lake Ontario, 1673, Frontenac wrote enthusiastically to Colbert of the promise of the Iroquois to give him their children to be taught the French tongue and to be raised in French manners and customs.[4] Later, in the same letter, he tells the minister that the Jesuits had offered to take the children promised him by the Iroquois, and he had refused their request; they should take other children and the results of *his* training could be compared with theirs.

---

[2] Colbert to Frontenac, June 13, 1673, Clément, III², 559; RAPQ, 1927, 26.

[3] Hennepin first stated in his *New Discovery,* that the Indians "have among them a Form of Political government," *A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America,* Thwaites ed., 2 vols., Chicago, 1903, I, 216. In his second volume, *A New Voyage,* in keeping with the idea he had of the Indians, forgetting what he had written before, he wrote: "They live without any subordination, without Laws or any form of Government or Policy," *ibid.,* II, 456. "The Iroquois have their government like all the other nations of the world. The only difference is that theirs may be called purely natural, wherein many things are wanting," Father Chauchetière's account of the Mission du Sault, *Jesuit Relations,* 63:162.

> I have already made known to Father Chaumonot, in charge of the Hurons, who have their village two leagues from Quebec and who are about to found a new village, that I expected them to build their huts regularly with French chimneys, and that little by little they adopt our manners and our customs.[5]
> I shall even try this winter [1673] to learn a little of their language, and if I succeed, I hope to be a good missionary, and perhaps help in frenchifying the Indians as much as the next man.[6]

Colbert congratulated him for what he had done and wrote: "His Majesty desires you to continue to encourage the Jesuits, the Recollects, and the Montreal Seminary to take young Indians to rear and instruct them in the Faith and lead them to associate with the French."[7]

Colbert gave Frontenac scant praise in his letter of May, 1674;[8] hence the governor had all the more reasons to develop the theme which had previously brought congratulations. He announced success with the Iroquois:

> They have come this year in solemn embassy to Montreal to give me eight of their children, belonging to the principal and first families of their villages. . . . The Jesuit Fathers, who know them better than any one, were at first surprised, and could never believe, until they had seen it, that they had resolved to give me their children. Yet, here they are, eight of them on my hands, who are so many hostages, responsible to me for the peace

---

[4] Cf. NYCD, IX, 108, 110-111.

[5] Frontenac here refers to the migration of Indians from Notre-Dame-Sainte-Foye to Lorette, cf. *Relations inédites,* I, 295, 296, 299, 305, 306, 310, 313, etc. His conversation with Father Chaumont took place shortly before the date of his letter. The governor was one of the first to make a pilgrimage to the new shrine, *ibid.,* 302.

[6] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 39.

[7] Colbert to Frontenac, May 17, 1674, Clément, III^2, 580; RAPQ, 1927, 59; NYCD, IX, 115.

[8] Colbert to Frontenac, May 17, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 55-60, and cf. the second paragraph of Frontenac's answer, November 14, 1674, *ibid.,* 60-61.

> of this colony, and which they will not dare, henceforth, to break.

Of these eight, four were boys; Frontenac placed two in a boarding house, and two in his own, but they will be "sent for instruction every day to the Jesuit Fathers."

> I conformed to the orders you gave me to continue to encourage the Jesuits, the Seminary of Montreal, and the Recollects to take young Indians for the purpose of instructing them in the faith and civilizing them. The last [Recollects] ask for nothing better, and they will do their best at the Cataracouy Mission where they will assuredly succeed. As for the others, I have shown them an example, and demonstrated to them that, whenever they are disposed to make use of the credit and influence which they have with the Indians, they will civilize them, and will have like me some of their children.
>
> But, for reasons I have already stated to you, and which it is useless to repeat, ' tis a thing they will never do unless absolutely constrained thereto.
>
> They will act in like manner respecting the extension of their missions, on which subject I have spoken to them in the manner you ordered, but in vain, for they have declared to me they were here only to endeavor to instruct the Indians, or rather 2 20 20 12 39 18 68 17 239 [*attirer des castors,* to get the beavers] and not to be parish priests to the French.
>
> They have affirmed the same a week ago, and withdrew two Fathers whom they always kept at their settlement at the Cap de la Madeleine, one of the most populous in the country, because a sufficient number of Indians do not resort there at this moment; and when I wished to represent mildly to the Father Superior the inconvenience the people were subject to for want of spiritual aid, he did not hesitate to give me the same reasons I have already stated to you.
>
> Nevertheless, after they resolved not to leave any of their Fathers there, the charitable admonitions I addressed to them have obliged them, a few days ago, to alter their determination, and the Superior has since come to inform me that they would leave one there, but I believe it will be only for this winter to allow the public talk that would ensue to blow over. If the Recollects were more numerous, and if they [*on,* scl. Laval] were willing to employ them, they would assuredly do wonders in the missions, but the two, whom you did me the honor to inform me you had asked for last year, did not come, nor the four this

year. I presume they were retarded by some mysterious means, as there begins to be great jealousy of them, however fair a face be shown them. They stand in need of good subjects, and more of them. You should tell the Bishop that you desire him not to allow them to remain idle, but that he send them into adjoining and distant missions. The Superior who came last year is a very great preacher; he has overshadowed and has given some chagrin to those in this country who certainly are not so able.[9]

The ciphered passage is an echo of what he had written two years before, and was so gross that it defeated its purpose. It was probably repeated in the hope that the next letter from Colbert would be more eulogistic than the one he was answering.

The Jesuit superior merely stated a truth when he told Frontenac the Jesuits had not come to be parish priests of the French. The benefactors contributed money for the missions of New France on the understanding that it would help to support the missionaries among the Indians. And when the missionaries themselves volunteered for Canada, and when superiors sent them, it was with the purpose of evangelizing the Indians and for this purpose they asked for the missions. Concerning Frontenac's comparison between the Jesuits, the other priests then in Canada, and the Recollects, true or false, it was bound to arouse dissension.[10] The archives are silent about the progress in the frenchification of the Indians which Frontenac promised and which in his letter to the provincial of the Recollects he termed so noticeable.[11] Nor is there mention of any permanent results achieved by those missionaries.

---

[9] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, AC C 11A, 4:79v-80; RAPQ, 1927, 75; translation from NYCD, IX, 117-118, 120-121.

[10] Cf. the letter of Father Eustache Maupassant to Colbert, November 12, 1674, BN, Mélanges Colbert, 171:57-58, printed in the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXVII, 1931, 602-603, under the date of 1679.

[11] Cf. Frontenac to the Provincial of the Recollects, BN, Mélanges Colbert, 171:54-55, printed in the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXVII, 1931, 677-679. Lorin, 67, wrote: "Et qu'on n'aille pas soutenir qu'au Canada des écoles de ce genre étaient impossibles; à l'époque même où Frontenac se plaignait que pas un des sauvages de Notre-Dame [de Sainte Foye], à une lieue et demie de Québec, ne parlât français, les Récollets établis au nouveau fort du lac Ontario

The answer of Colbert to the governor's letter of November 14, 1674, again disappointed Frontenac. The minister began by notifying him that "in the future, he will have to write directly to the king, and not to me, as you have been doing until now."[12] Frontenac was disappointed because he would scarcely dare write his malevolent letters to Louis XIV. With regard to the frenchification scheme, his ardor must have been dampened when he read:

> His Majesty is also confident that the example you have given the Jesuits and the priests of the Seminary of Montreal, by assuming the charge of some little Indians, will induce them also to rear and instruct some others in our customs and in the principles of Christianity; and His Majesty orders me to mention to you on this point the propriety of exciting those ecclesiastics to take charge, voluntarily, of those little Indians, but it is not feasible to constrain them to do so.[13]

The letter of the king, in answer to Frontenac, is dated April 22, 1675; there is not one word about the frenchification *à outrance* suggested by Frontenac.[14] The next mention of the scheme occurs in a letter of Louis XIV, May 12, 1678. He states: "His Majesty is equally well pleased to hear that the education of the Indian children continues. Endeavor to increase their number, and though it be proper to give their parents to understand that they are not retained by force,

---

donnaient aux indigènes une éducation toute française. . . ." It is regrettable that Lorin did not give a more specific date, "à l'époque même" is vague enough to be on the safe side. The two references given to support this assertion are two letters of Frontenac to Colbert, of November 2, 1672, and November 14, 1674. There is not one word about the "éducation toute française" in the first; at that time Fort Frontenac did not exist. As for the second letter, it is quoted above, and the reader can see for himself whether there is question of the Recollects actually giving such an education. It is somewhat strange that we no longer hear of the "éducation toute française" imparted at Fort Frontenac in the governor's correspondence, except in the memoir of 1678, where we are told that La Salle had a school of "more than fifty children, several of whom already begin to know how to read and write," Margry, I, 320. On this document, and on the real state of affairs at Fort Frontenac, cf. *infra.*, 186 ff.

[12] Colbert to Frontenac, March 15, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 79; NYCD, IX, 123; cf. Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 80.

[13] Colbert to Frontenac, March 15, 1675, NYCD, 123; *Collection de Manuscrits . . .*, I, 232; RAPQ, 1927, 79; NYCD, 123.

[14] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 80-83, see Colbert's covering letter of May 13, *ibid.*, 83-84.

it is well to retain the greatest possible number of them."[15] The next year, Colbert merely says:

> Take as many as possible. . . . You will observe that although His Majesty thinks it advantageous to attract entire Indian villages within and in between the French settlements, nevertheless it would be better to mix the Indians with the French in much smaller numbers, that is, one Indian for seven or eight Frenchmen in the localities settled by the French.[16]

This is quite different from what Colbert had written ten years before to Talon. The reasons for Frontenac's subsequent silence about the frenchification scheme are not difficult to deduce. On the one hand, most of Frontenac's time was absorbed by his squabbles with Duchesneau and the Sovereign Council; the brandy question was coming to a head, and the governor had excellent reasons to be much more interested in the latter than in frenchifying the Indians. On the other hand, his silence can only be explained by his failure to make Frenchmen out of his wards. After heralding his program in 1674, he had failed as every one before him had failed. Otherwise, one may be quite sure, when recounting to the king in 1680 all he had done for the frenchification of the Indians, he would have made capital of his success. Instead he wrote:

> Since I came to this country, there is nothing I have labored at more zealously than to induce everybody, whether ecclesiastic or secular, to rear or maintain some Indian children, and to attract their fathers and mothers to our settlements, the better to instruct them in the Christian religion and French manners. I have joined example to my exhortations, having always brought up some in my own family and elsewhere, at my own expense, and impressed incessantly on the Ursuline Nuns and the Jesuit Fathers not to inculcate any other sentiment in those under their control. Nevertheless, the latter having pretended that the communication with the French corrupted the Indians and was an obstacle to the instruction they were giving them. Father Frémin, Superior of La Prairie de la Madeleine, far from conforming to

---

[15] Louis XIV to Frontenac, May 12, 1678, *ibid.*, 96; NYCD, IX, 128.

[16] Colbert to Frontenac, May 8, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 100-101; cf. Colbert to Duchesneau, May 8, 1679, AC, B 8:15v-16.

> what I told him was Your Majesty's intentions, has three years since removed all the Indians who were intermingled there with the French to a distance of two leagues further off, on the lands obtained for M. Duchesneau on his arrival in this country, the title of which I did not think proper to give them until I should learn your Majesty's pleasure, for reasons I have the honor to submit which are of importance for his service and for the advantage and safety of the country.
>
> I hope the mission established by the ecclesiastics of the Montreal Seminary within half a league of their town will be an example to all others, and will induce those to visit it who have been most opposed to it, either from interest or otherwise.[17]

A shift is noticeable. The securing of young Indians is set forth in general terms and in passing. No mention is made of the Recollects. If the work was of such paramount importance, so practicable, why had they not been entrusted with the task of frenchifying the Indians? They were not averse to the task, nor was their policy contrary to it, as that of the Jesuits was supposed to be. A new note is struck in the letter to the king. The Jesuits opposed the intermingling of French and Indians, but the governor does not give the reason except in general terms, namely, fear of the corruptive influence of the French. What this influence was will be seen in the discussion of the brandy trade. This much talked of amalgamation, on which so great a store was set, "in no way helped the Indians and was harmful to the French."[18] The Recollect Sagard[19] had noted long before Frontenac's time the bad effect Indian life had on the whites. It was held that a Frenchman became an Indian sooner than an Indian became French. Longer experience only confirmed this truism. A modern student paraphrased it, when he called it "the revenge of America,"[20] dragging down the invader to her own level of barbarism.[21] The harm done by the attempted amalgamation of races was generally recognized by responsible officials during the latter part of the seventeenth century.[22] Le Clercq, or to speak more accurately the editor of the *First Establishment,* is the only one to extoll a system of colonization which the experience of more than half a century had condemned.

---

[17] Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 4, 1679, AC C 11A, 5:15; RAPQ, 1927, 110; NYCD, IX, 130.

[18] La Tour, 98.

[19] Sagard, *Histoire du Canada . . .*, Paris, 1636, 170.

[20] Salone, 255.

[21] Cf. Garneau, I, 195; *Peter Kalm's Travels,* II, 456-457.

In his answer, the king says not a word about disobedience charged against the Jesuits. Frontenac received a most scathing reply from Colbert[23] and from Louis XIV.[24] Neither refers to the Jesuits' contempt of the royal wishes and orders. It is Frontenac whom the king accuses of disobeying his most positive orders about the *coureurs de bois,* of failing to secure peace for his susbjects, or not promoting the true interests of the colony. The king realized what every student of the contemporary records will realize—that to divert attention from his own behavior, Frontenac accused others of the very misdeeds he himself was guilty of. With regard to his refusal to sign the title deed of the land grant asked by the Jesuits, the king wrote:

> I granted to the Jesuit Fathers the tract of land they asked of me for the Iroquois settlement. It is the place called the Sault, adjoining the Prairie de la Madeleine. I have made them this gift and approved of their conditions, because I deem this settlement not only conducive to convert the Indians to the Christian faith, but also because they will thereby become accustomed to the manners and ways of living of the French. Although you may have known that the conversion of the Indians in all their villages was not advantageous because they would easily return to their idolatry, nevertheless, when whole Indian villages move to those parts settled by my subjects, their settlement among the French can only be very advantageous, and you must always urge and encourage such Indian settlements and give them all the protection you can.[25]

There was a change in the policy previously advocated by the government in Paris. The king here repeats what Colbert had written the year before. In his reply, Frontenac no longer mentions the Jesuits nor their disobedience; instead, he praises the Sulpicians who were doing what the Jesuits had been doing:

---

[22] Denonville to Seignelay, November 12, 1685, AC, C 11A, 7:90v. Cf. NYCD, IX, 277; the objections of the Indians themselves in Lahontan, II, 444.

[23] Colbert to Frontenac, April 20, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 112-113.

[24] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 29, 1680, *ibid.,* 113-116.

[25] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 29, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 115.

> It would not be doing justice to the Gentlemen of the Seminary of Montreal if I did not assure your Majesty of the pains they continue to take to increase their Indian mission, and to induce the savages to abandon their barbarous customs and adopt ours. The memoir, which according to your order I am sending, will more fully explain their success. This progress begins to produce good effects in the other missions, in which the Indians, after the example of the former, already have fowls, hogs, and French grain. This is what I always expected.[26]

It is clear who operated the "other missions," but Frontenac did not wish to say that the Jesuits were doing as they had always done and in the manner with which heretofore he had always found fault.

The proof of this assertion is found in a source which cannot be suspected of partiality, the letters of M. Tronson. It is not here denied that later, under the zealous, energetic impulse of M. de Belmont, there were differences between the methods of evangelization adopted by the Sulpicians and the Jesuits in their respective permanent Indian settlements, but these changes took place after Frontenac had left Canada. The short sketch which follows will give a beginning of explanation for Frontenac writing as he did in 1681.

Although M. de Fénelon had been blamed by his superiors for his stand in the Perrot affair, the relations between the governor and the Sulpicians remained strained. Frontenac, however, would much prefer not to be at war with the priests of Montreal, for his superior, M. Tronson, had the ear of Colbert. Tronson made recommendations to his subordinates to live in peace with the governor, and Madame de Frontenac impressed upon her husband the need of having M. Tronson on his side as a great help. She went to St. Sulpice and assured Tronson to this effect:

> Her husband would be delighted to live on good terms with us, that she would write to him, and that she was sure, if he re-

---

[26] Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 2, 1681, *ibid.,* 129; NYCD, IX, 148-149.

ceived her letter, he would give you [Dollier, who was returning to Canada] a hearty welcome, for he wishes for nothing better than peace. I assured her that, on our side, we would leave nothing undone to foster peace and to give him all possible satisfaction. . . .[27]

Frontenac wrote to Tronson stating the sponge had erased the past, and the latter assured Mme de Frontenac that as far as he was concerned everything was forgotten.[28] Tronson was sincere. After the return of Perrot, the governors of New France and of Montreal had come to an understanding. But when, a few years later, Perrot was in Paris, he spoke against Frontenac in a manner which could not fail to harm the governor, for Perrot was supported by Talon. Mme de Frontenac came to the rescue of her husband. She went to Tronson several times and he says: "We have worked together. . . . She is convinced of the service I rendered him with M. Colbert, to whom I made no complaint against M. de Frontenac." The governor's wife had reason to be grateful, for one word from M. Tronson would have spelled disaster. The Sulpician did complain of Perrot to the minister, and "M. Colbert reprimanded Perrot sharply in public, and M. Colbert told me he would tell Perrot that, if he did not change, the king would recall him next year."[29] Tronson showed Colbert the letter of Frontenac in which the governor speaks of the "sponge" passing over the disagreements of the past, which of necessity pleased the minister "who has nothing so much at heart as harmony and union in the colony."[30]

Frontenac paid his debt to Tronson in the best possible manner. He praised the Indian settlement near Montreal, known as the Mission de la Montagne. Shortly after its foundation, Tronson had feared lest the means for supporting this mission might not be found.[31] But the following year, he realized that his priests could teach the Indians gathered near Montreal. He wrote to Canada for information about "what could be done to win over the Indian children to instruct them . . . for this is here, at the Court, the great aim."[32] The following month, he wrote to Dollier: "M. Colbert again spoke to me of the Indian children. He has this much at heart. See what can be done to satisfy him."[33] Dollier, having answered Tronson informing him of his plans to begin primary schools for the children, received in reply: "M. Colbert gives his full approval to your plan . . . and he is convinced nothing more useful could be done. I was dining at his house a few days ago and he did me the favor to listen attentively to all I said about our affairs. . . . "[34] They were to spare nothing to make a success of this undertaking; they were all the more bound to exert themselves, since Colbert had ordered a special gratuity to be paid to the Sulpicians of Montreal for the instruction of the Indian children.[35] When the news that a school had been begun[36] reached Paris in 1680, it "gave us much joy, because nothing is more desired here, and because it is believed nothing could be more fruitful."[37] Frontenac could not be unaware of all this. He knew better than any one else how much Colbert was interested in the frenchification scheme. His wife and his friends had certainly coached him on what to write to Paris and the letter he wrote in 1681 shows how well he had hearkened to the advice.[38]

---

[27] Tronson to Dollier, July 5, 1678, no. 68.

[28] Tronson to Dollier, March 14, 1679, no. 71.

[29] *Id.* to *id.,* May 1679, no. 76, the quotation is in code.

[30] Tronson to Frontenac, May 27, 1679, no. 95.

[31] Tronson to Lefebvre, April 5, 1677, no. 6, *id.* to Remy, April 5, 1677, no. 9.

Was there much difference at this time between the methods of the Jesuits and those of the Sulpicians? The letter of Duchesneau to Colbert written ten days after that of Frontenac to the king gives the answer:

> You will perceive, my lord, by the census of the Indians I have taken this year, how their number is increased by 207 persons. I make bold to state to you, that, amidst all the plans presented to me to attract the Indians among us and to accustom them to

---

[32] *Id.* to Bailly, April 22, 1678, no. 49.

[33] *Id.* to Dollier, May 30, 1678, no. 60.

[34] *Id.* to *id.*, March 14, 1679, no. 71; cf. *id.* to *id.*, March 16, 1679, no. 72.

[35] *Id.* to *id.*, May 1679, no. 74; cf. AC, B 7:90; Tronson to Dollier, 1681, no. 151.

[36] *Id.* to Ranuyer, May 10, 1679, no. 90.

[37] *Id.* to Dollier, 1680, no. 98.

[38] Cf. *id.* to Frontenac, April 20, 1680, no. 116; *id.* to *id.*, June 2, 1681, no. 146.

our manners, the one from which most success may be anticipated, without fearing the inconveniences common to all the others, is to establish villages of these people in our midst.

It appears even to be the best, since in the Mission of the Mountain of Montreal, governed by the Gentlemen of the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, and in the one of the Sault de la Prairie de la Madeleine, in its vicinity, and in those of Sillery and Lorette in the neighborhood of Quebec, all three under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers, the youth are all brought up *à la française,* except in the matter of their food and dress, which it is necessary to make them retain lest they be effeminate, and so that they be more at liberty and less impeded whilst hunting, which constitutes their wealth and ours. A beginning has been made in all these missions to instruct the young boys in reading and writing; at the Mountain of Montreal, the Ladies of the Sodality devote themselves to the instruction of the little girls, and employ them in needle work; the Ursulines at Quebec act in the same way towards those given to them, whom they receive indifferently from all the missions, whether established among us or in the Indian country under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers. On this point you will permit me, my lord, if you please, to state two things to you: first, those missions cannot be too much encouraged, nor can too much countenance be given to the gentlemen of Saint Sulpice and the Jesuit Fathers among the Indians, inasmuch as they not only place the country in security and bring peltries hither, but greatly glorify God and the King, as the eldest son of the Church, by reason of the large number of good Christians formed there. Secondly, His Majesty may perhaps have it in his power to increase essentially this great good, were he to order me to make in his name a few presents to the Indians of the villages established among us, so as to attract a great number of them; and were he to destine a small fund for the Indian girls who quit the Ursulines on being educated, to fit out and marry them, and establish Christian families through their means. I shall not fail, my lord, to exhort the inhabitants to rear Indians, and shall not be discouraged giving them the example, notwithstanding three have already left me, after I had incurred considerable expense over them, because I would oblige them to learn something. The Jesuit Fathers have been more fortunate than I, and have some belonging to the most distant tribes, such as Illinois and Mohegans, who know how to read, write, speak French and play on instruments.[39]

---

[39] Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 13, 1681, NYCD, IX, 150.

Frenchification during Frontenac's first term thus ended with silence on the part of the governor and with the Jesuits doing what seemed to them most practicable. Frontenac's silence is significant in as much as it reveals him no longer inclined to criticize the missionaries for not turning droves of Indians into Frenchmen overnight by an application of his novel and impractical educational theories. At the end of his first term Frontenac had a better knowledge of the difficulties entailed in the raising of papooses *à la française*. From the governor's silence, it may safely be assumed that the Jesuits were at least as successful as the character of a papoose would allow; otherwise, it is more than likely that he would have become vociferous about their failure.

The question flared up once again during Frontenac's second term. Some Iroquois Christian Indians of Sault St. Louis, near Montreal, in an expedition against their heathen brothers had acted in a manner savoring of betrayal of the French cause. The Jesuits, of course, were the cause of this, because they showed too much complaisance with these Indians. Frontenac wrote:

> An experience acquired by a sojourn of twelve years in this colony has taught me that all these mission settlements ought never to be separated as they are from the French, and that the Indians should always remain with the French in order to be frenchified while being converted. Otherwise, these missions will do more harm than good in the service of the king and even to that of God. It is a gospel which I have never been able to have accepted in this country, and which I have preached in vain for so long that I should be disheartened and say nothing more about it.[40]

Charlevoix saw in the Archives of Paris this letter which Frontenac had written to Pontchartrain. The historian of New France took up vigorously the defense of the Iroquois, whom the governor had maligned because they were directed by the Jesuits, and the challenge of the twelve years' experience as follows:

---

[40] Frontenac to Pontchartrain, October 30, 1691, AC C 11A, 11: 234; RAPQ, 1928, 69.

> If these Christians on some occasions did not do all expected of them, if some individuals acted from motives other than those inculcated upon them, no one before or after Frontenac thought fit to make the whole town reponsible, much less those who directed it; and an experience not of ten years, but of more than a century [when Charlevoix wrote] has taught us that the worst system of governing these people and maintaining them in our interest is to bring them in contact with the French, whom they would have esteemed more had they seen them less closely.
>
> In fine, there was no longer any doubt that the best mode of Christianizing them was to avoid frenchifying them. In the seven or eight months that the Iroquois of the Sault and the Mountain spent at Montreal, after the massacre of Lachine [1689], they became unrecognizable, both as regards morals and piety, and there is no one who does not admit that if their fervor is no more as it was for so long, the edification and admiration of New France, it is because they have had too many relations with us.[41] The example of the Abenaqui nations, much further removed from the French settlements, whose attachment to our interests could go no further, alone sufficed to convince the General of the fallacy of this principle. His complaints and his advice were little regarded at Court, where they were at last persuaded that his project, which they had taken up so warmly thirty years before, was neither useful nor practicable.[42]

The practicability and utility of the frenchification scheme was later asserted by one who may be looked upon as an understudy of the governor a few years after Frontenac wrote as above to Pontchartrain. This was Cadillac who merely repeated the arguments current long before he came to America. The founder and commandant of Detroit asked for ten years and a free hand. He pledged himself to have the Indians of Canada speaking French in a decade, living like Frenchmen, and becoming as Frenchmen. He had his ten years during which he was the absolute master in Detroit, unimpeded by the Jesuits, untrammeled in the application of his educational theories. At the end of this time, he could show only one Indian able to say a few words of French, and these were learned not at Detroit but at Michilimackinac.

---

[41] Lahontan, *New Voyages,* II, 444, 536, makes Adario say what he himself had witnessed. It is doubtful whether such examples given by the French were conducive to the moral uplift, to the "civilization" of the Indians. Cf. also Perrot, *Memoire sur les Moeurs . . . ,* 312.

[42] Charlevoix, IV, 198; cf. Salone, 261-263.

In 1709, two years before Cadillac left Detroit for Louisiana, the younger Raudot wrote in his *Relation par lettres* what many who had dealt with the Indians had written half a century before. Frenchification was no longer the easy task lightly spoken of by lay and clerical dreamers of the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Officialdom had begun to see how disheartening were the results, and it no longer attributed the failure to the Jesuits. It was a tardy realization of the magnitude of the task of ridding the Indians of their centuries-old racial characteristics and of inspiring the aborigines of North America with imitations of the splendor and the politeness of Versailles.

> I shall speak to you in general of the Indians who inhabit this vast continent and who are known to us. I shall speak of their dress, customs and religion such as they were before the coming of the French in this country, and I shall also note the changes which have taken place among them as a result of the relations with us. Such changes are noticed only with respect to religion, to their use of our fire arms, and of our merchandise, but you will notice no changes in their conduct, their government, or in their dress.[43] It is a surpising thing that among so many nations not one has yet adopted our manners, and although they live constantly in the midst of the French, they still conduct themselves, until this day, in the same manner as they always have. They much prefer their hard but lazy mode of life, their free and libertine life, to the most agreeable one we can set before them. The woods and the forests are their palaces. There they live, and although brought up by Frenchmen from their tenderest years, and educated in convents, at the first whim, they abandon us to lead in the woods a very much different life from that which they led among us. Infinite labor and time will be needed to liberate them and to lead them to adopt our manners and customs. Only by continual application will we gradually

---

[43] Cf. Lafitau, *Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriquains,* II, 31; *Jesuit Relations,* 62, 184.

succeed in this task, and it will be, I assure you, a work of several centuries.[44]

---

[44] *Relation par lettres de l'Amérique Septentrionale, (années 1709 et 1710),* Paris, 1904, 61-62. These letters attributed by the editor, Father de Rochemonteix, to Father Silvy, are in reality by A. D. Raudot, the intendant of New France. On the back of a document entitled: "Suite de Relations par lettres de l'Amérique Septentrionale," AC, C 11A, 122, Margry has the following note: "Cette relation est faire par Raudot de fils sur les mémoires du S^r^ de Louvigny, 'pour ce qui regarde les Sauvages,' voir sa lettre du 24 septembre 1709." On the back of the cover of the copy book, 100 pages, is found the following unsigned note: "M^r^ de Fontanieu. Cecy est fait par M^r^ Raudot le fils Je vous en ay déjà envoyé la 1^ere^ partie. Cela mérite d'être examiné et gardé avec soin. Rien n'est plus capable de donner une connoisance du pays." Margry copied this note on some extracts he made from the manuscript, cf. Leland, *Guide to Materials for American History,* 105. Independently of the note on the manuscript, internal evidence shows that the letters were not written by Father Silvy, cf. H.-A. Scott, *Nos anciens Historiographies,* Lévis, 1930, 175, note 2.

THE BRANDY TRADE

THE BRANDY TRADE

Section 1. Before Talon.

The two reasons which led the missionaries to demand a complete separation between Indians and French were the example given by their compatriots and the sale of brandy to the Indians, and the latter was far the weightier. Several phases of this question are here distinguished, the brandy trade before Talon and Frontenac, and during their respective terms in office. No other conflict of opinion and policy aroused so much ire in Canada during the second half of the seventeenth century as the one hinging on brandy, and the question remained vital everywhere the French rule obtained in North America until the collapse of the French empire.[1]

According to the *Jesuit Relations,* brandy was introduced in Canada by the English between 1629 and 1632.[2] When the French returned to Canada, they followed in the footsteps of the English traders. The ravages of brandy, however, really became alarming in 1650; for, says La Tour, it was only in this year that "a considerable quantity was brought to Tadoussac where it was distributed to the Indians in exchange for their peltries, which they kept on doing during the years following."[3] One governor after another in Quebec, Champlain,[4] Montmagny,[5] d'Ailleboust,[6] Lauzon,[7] and Maisonneuve[8] in Montreal, forbade the traffic.

---

[1] *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana,* 403-448.

[2] *Jesuit Relations,* 9, 137, 24, 61. Rochemonteix, II, 314-315, Faillon, III 25 ff. But cf. Eastman, 26.

[3] La Tour, 98, cf. [F. V. de Belmont] "Histoire de l'eau-de-vie en Canada," in *Collection de Mémoires et de Relations sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada,* published by the Société Littéraire et Historique de Québec, 1840, n. 8, Introduction, and page 3. Where there are no Europeans, says Hennepin, *New Discovery,* I, 149, there is no brandy. Cf. Lafitau, *Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriquains,* Paris, 1724, II, 125, *Peter Kalm's Travels,* I, 259.

[4] *Jesuit Relations,* 5, 230.

[5] *Ibid.,* 24, 142; Mary of the Incarnation, 382.

[6] *Journal des Jésuites,* 228-229, Charlevoix, I, 242-243, Gosselin, I, 283.

[7] RAPQ, 1925, 384-386.

[8] Faillon, III, 31 f.

A royal edict was given March 7, 1657.[9] Yet all were powerless to check the abuse.

Whatever may be said of the wassail bowl as a means toward good fellowship among the whites had no application in regard to the Indians. Among the red men there was no idea of moderate drinking, nor of imbibing for any reason except complete, beastial intoxication. The gleam of lust for firewater came to the eyes of the Indian at the mere sight of a liquor container, and almost instinctively the Indian went for the alcoholic contents much as an animal goes for its prey. Once under the influence of liquor, the Indians no longer acted as humans nor Indians, but more as wild beasts. They indulged in the most terrifying excesses of debauchery, rape, incest, murder, parricide; fathers killed their children, drowning them or throwing them into the fire; husbands sold or killed their wives. Every known code of morals, customs, or honor of God, of the Church, of the French, and of the Indians ceased to exist. The women and even the children drank themselves into a fury. There were many isolated cases of sotted Indians bent upon individual iniquities, but also many times an entire village would be intoxicated, and the foul orgy never ceased until the last dregs of the barrel were drained. Such were the excesses which the bishop, the diocesan clergy, the Sulpicians, and the Jesuits denounced in the name of public good, humanity, and religion.[10]

> Those who have mingled somewhat with the savages (I speak only of those living near our settlements) are well aware that

---

[9] *Edits,* II, 7.

[10] Sagard had foreseen the disorders that would ensue from the sale of brandy to the Indians. Cf. *Histoire du Canada . . . ,* Paris, 1636, 295, 677. "This liquor also was entirely unknown to them before the Europeans came hither, but after they had tasted it, they could never get enough of it. A man can hardly have a greater desire for a thing than the Indians have for brandy. I have heard them say that to die by drinking brandy was a desirable and an honorable death; and indeed it was a very common thing to kill themselves by drinking this liquor to excess," *Peter Kalm's Travels,* I, 259. Among the goods the French sell to the Indians, Kalm lists "Brandy, which the Indians value above all other goods that can be brought them; nor have they anything, though ever so dear to them, which they would not give away for this liquor," *ibid.,* II, 521.

drink is a demon that robs them of their reason, and so inflames their passion that, after returning from the chase richly laden with beaver-skins, instead of furnishing their families with provisions, clothing, and other necessary supplies, they drink away the entire proceeds in one day and are forced to pass the winter in nakedness, famine, and all sorts of deprivation. There have been some whose mania was so extraordinary that, after stripping themselves of everything for liquor they sold even their own children to obtain the means of intoxication. Children, too, when they are overcome with drink, beat their parents without being punished for it; young men use it as a philter, corrupting the girls after making them drunk; those that have any quarrels pretend to be intoxicated in order to wreck vengeance with impunity. Every night is filled with clamors, brawls, and fatal accidents, which the intoxicated cause in the cabins. Everything is permitted them for they give as an excuse that they were bereft of reason at the time. One cannot conceive the disorders which this diabolical vice has caused in this new Church. We found neither time to instruct them nor means to inspire them with a horror of this sin; for they were always in a state of intoxication or of beggary—that is, either incapable of listening or constrained to go in quest of food in the woods."[11]

Besides these evils of which the missionaries naturally complained, unscrupulous traders were giving the Indians their fill of brandy the better to rob and cheat them. La Tour wrote:

---

[11] *Jesuit Relations,* 46, 102-104. For other descriptions of the ravages wrought by brandy among the Indians, about which one missionary wrote he had no "ink black enough," *ibid.,* 48, 62, cf. *Jesuit Relations,* 5, 230; 22, 240; 24, 142; 62, 224; Mary of the Incarnation, 571-572, Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* Paris, 1691, 430-432; [Dollier de Casson], "Histoire du Montréal," in *Manuscripts relating to the Early History of Canada,* published under the Auspices of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, Third series, no. 1, Quebec, 114; *Relations inédites,* I, 41, 42. Laymen who witnessed the orgy did not speak differently. So independent a man as Boucher, because of the havoc of the brandy trade heartily sympathized with the bishop and the Jesuits in their opposition to the traffic, *Histoire veritable et naturelle des Moeurs et Productions du Pays de la Nouvelle France,* Montreal, 1882, 98; cf. Lahontan, *New Voyages,* Thwaites edition, Chicago, 1903, I, 81, 94, 124, 466. Bacqueville de La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amerique,* Amsterdam, 1723, I, 344-345. *Relation par lettres de l'Amérique Septentrionale,* 190. La Chesnaye wrote in 1693, "I tell you in all conscience, Sir, that one cannot better represent hell than by the view of Indians and squaws intoxicated," AC, C 11A, 12:380. "We have here [Sault St. Louis] no other demon to contend with than liquor and drunkenness, which makes a hell of all the Iroquois villages . . . ," *Jesuit Relations,* 62, 182.

> If it is difficult to explain the excess of the Indians, it is also hard to understand to what lengths the greed, the bad faith, the knavery of those who sell hard liquors to the Indians will go. The easy profits they can make owing to the natives' ignorance and their passion for brandy, joined to the certitude of being unpunished, are charms to which these traders abandon themselves; their eagerness for profits has the same effect on them as drunkenness has on the Indians.[12]

They sold brandy for its weight in gold; they mixed salt and water with the liquor; they used false measures; at times they killed or more often robbed the stupified Indians with impunity.[13]

This was the state of affairs when Laval arrived in Quebec. "This condition deeply moved the heart of Monseigneur de Petraea, who, seeing the fortunes of this new Christendom in danger of ruin, unless these evils were abolished, turned all his attention toward finding a remedy for the evil which until then seemed incurable."[14] Laval, indeed, was of a character not to hesitate for long when he saw the conversion of the Indians thus being jeopardized by the brandy peddlers.[15] But before taking the grave step he contemplated, he wished the advice of others. According to the Journal of the Jesuits, two months after his arrival a first consultation was held at the Jesuit house in Quebec, a second within a week at the same place, and the day after the second, a third conference was held at the bishop's house.[16] The subject of the conferences was to determine whether the bishop was justified in excommunicating those who sold brandy to the Indians. Six months later, on May 5, 1659, eve of the Ascension, Laval launched the excommunication incurred *ipso facto* by all who sold or distributed gratis either wine or brandy to the Indians, reserving to himself alone the right and power to absolve the transgressors. However, they would not fall under the excommunication who give a little brandy to the Indians in journeys, or in work of extraordinary hardships; but even in this case, the excommunication would obtain if the ordinary quantity given to French servants in similar circumstances were exceeded. "But let it be known that when it is question of directly or indirectly obtaining pelts, shoes, or anything whatsoever, it is in no way allowed to give drinks to the Indians, not even as much as the above small draught, lest those who do fall under our defense and excommunication."[17] The censure upheld by the priests and the confessors put an end to the prevalent disorders.[18] The new governor, d'Avaugour, enforced the measure issuing severe orders against selling brandy to the Indians.[19]

---

[12] La Tour, 70. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* 427, does not speak differently. There was a wrong done not only to the Indians, but the traffickers themselves were committing a sin of theft. They stole from the Indians when they cheated them. It is against such an evil that Le Clercq protested when he said that the French's salvation was jeopardized, cf. the translation of Le Clercq, by W. F. Ganong, *New Relation of Gaspesia,* Toronto, 1910, 253. The Recollect means the French, it is not misprint for *sauvages,* he looked at the traffic from the justice point of view and shows how the sin of theft was committed by the French who cheated the Indians, a sin which could not be forgiven unless restitution be made "au prorata de ce que la chose peut valoir."

[13] *Histoire de l'eau-de-vie-en Canada,* 7-8, 18-20, Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* 428-429; Mary of the Incarnation, 642; Perrot, *Memoire sur les Moeurs . . . ,* 115-119.

[14] *Jesuit Relations,* 46, 104, cf. Boucher, *Histoire veritable,* 99, 118.

[15] *Histoire du Montréal,* 114, cf. *Relations inédites,* I, 184.

According to La Tour, the improvement soon came to nought due to a trifling incident. A woman of Quebec caught contravening the orders was put in jail. Her relatives prevailed upon Father Lalemant, the Jesuit superior in Quebec, to intercede with the governor. The Jesuit appealed to the governor for leniency in this particular case. In a moment of bad humor, d'Avaugour answered that if the trade was not crime for this woman, it would not be a crime for anybody.[20] This, to say the least, was bad logic. A law should not be abolished or its violation permitted because leniency is asked for a delinquent. The brandy peddlers soon heard that the governor would no longer punish the traffic and enforce the ordinances. All the former excesses, the former disorders reappeared. Catechumens abandoned all thought of becoming Christians, neophytes apostatized, Christians gave themselves up to all sorts of vices.[21] The bishop, the clergy, the Jesuits, the Indians themselves[22] expostulated with d'Avaugour, all to no purpose. With an inflexible stubbornness he stood fast in the posture he had adopted.[23] Thereupon Laval renewed the excommunication of 1660 which had been suspended in 1661.[24] The brandy traders directed their attacks against the prelate, the clergy, and the Jesuits. They were accused of unjustly troubling the consciences of the people, of imperiling the future of the colony, and of causing prejudice to religion.[25] The Church, they claimed, had no power over matters of this nature. It was an unwarranted intrusion upon civil power. The French paid no attention to the remonstrances of the bishop, writes Mother Mary of the Incarnation "because they were upheld by the strong arm of the secular power;" [26] that is, d'Avaugour lived up to his sally of humor and shut his eyes to the consequences. Not knowing how to put a stop to those abuses, Laval determined to go to France and appeal to the king.[27]

---

[16] *Journal des Jésuites,* 268, 269.

[17] *Mandements, Lettres pastorales et circulaires des Evêques de Québec,* H. Têtu and C.-O. Gagnon, ed., Quebec, 1887, I, 14-15, to be cited as *Mandements; Journal des Jésuites,* 282; La Tour, 72; Gosselin, I, 290.

[18] *Jesuit Relations,* 46, 104.

[19] *Journal des Jésuites,* 303, La Tour, 80, Faillon, III, 30.

[20] La Tour, 80, Charlevoix, III, 53.

The bishop had been preceded by memoirs in which the traders complained of the intolerable severity of the clergy. They asked for freedom in liquor trading under the plea of public welfare and of the development of commerce in the colony. They did not upbraid the bishop, for he was held in high regard by the king and his mother, Anne of Austria. Hence they threw the blame on the Jesuits. They wanted to dominate New France, the memoirs said; Laval was only a tool in their hands;[28] they have made and unmade governors according to their whim; they were constantly tyrannizing over consciences with their threat of excommunication; they were much too severe; they wanted to rule Canada as if it were a convent.

---

[21] *Jesuit Relations,* 48, 62; La Tour, 81; Mary of the Incarnation, 571; Charlevoix, III, 53-55.

[22] Mary of the Incarnation, 572.

[23] Parkman, *The Old Régime in Canada,* Boston, 1892, 123.

[24] *Mandements,* I, 42; Gosselin, I, 299, 300, 301.

[25] La Tour, 81-82. "Il est étonnant que dans un livre sur le Canada, qui a paru sous le nom d'un Récollet, [*First Establishment of the Faith*], sans doute à son insçû, on ait adopté ces calumnies," *ibid.,* 82. Cf. Charlevoix, III, 54. The contradictory attitude of Father Le Clercq in the *First Establishment* and in the *Nouvelle Relation* is another indication that the Recollect's book was tampered with. In his *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* he denounces the traffic no less vigorously than did the bishop and the Jesuits.

[26] Mary of the Incarnation, 572.

[27] *Journal des Jésuites,* 310; Mary of the Incarnation, 572; Charlevoix, III, 35.

In France, Laval had much difficulty in getting his views with regard to the brandy traffic accepted by the king;[29] but the bishop finally obtained what he had come to ask, the recall of d'Avaugour and an interdict on the brandy trade.[30] He returned to his diocese with the new governor Mézy. When he reached Quebec, however, there was no need of using the powers he had secured for ending the brandy traffic for the earthquake which shook Canada intermittently for several months had been looked upon as a warning from God and so terrified the inhabitants that the "scandalous brandy traffic had stopped as if by enchantment."[31] The bishop made use of this lull to organize his diocese and Mézy inaugurated in Canada the new administrative system, which with few changes obtained until the fall of New France.

All went well for a time between Laval and Mézy.[32] The newly created sovereign council issued several decrees against the brandy traffic,[33] and enforced the royal edict of 1657. However, the harmony between Laval and Mézy did not last. What took place is set forth in Talon's instructions:

> He will learn that the Jesuits made so many complaints two years ago against Baron du Bois d'Avaugour, then governor of

---

[28] This foolish assertion will henceforth be repeatedly met with, and will even find its way into a royal memoir. It is an insult to the great bishop. Laval was willing to take advice, but he was not the man to allow any dictation as to how he should rule his diocese, cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 40, note 1; Lorin, 43; La Tour, 71.

[29] Mary of the Incarnation, 589; Charlevoix, III, 55.

[30] La Tour, 83; Gosselin, I, 351.

[31] Rochemonteix, II, 326. Cf. *Jesuit Relations,* 48, 58 ff., Mary of the Incarnation, 589; La Tour, 189 ff., and Charlevoix, III, 57 ff.

[32] Mary of the Incarnation, 589.

[33] *Edits,* II, 6; *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 8, 64, 170, 186, 188.

the country, since killed whilst defending with great valor Fort Serin on the confines of Croatia against the Turks,[34] that the king to satisfy them, resolved not only to recall him, but even to leave them the choice of another governor. They then set eyes on Sieur de Mézy, Major of the town of Caen, who openly professed to lead a pious life and whom they doubtless believed would be guided by their opinions. But they found themselves mistaken in their calculations when he was in possession of the government; for divers passions of anger and avarice, which he had concealed in the beginning, burst forth, as they represent, to the great detriment of the King's service and of the colony; several times he suspended and reinstalled, according to his pleasure, the officers of the Sovereign Council; but what seems essential in this dispute is, that within twenty-four hours time, he caused Sieur Bourdon, Attorney-general, and Villeray, Councillor, to embark and depart; since it was impossible for the king to approve this violent conduct, His Majesty ordered commissions to be issued to the said Sieur de Tracy, and Sieur de Courcelle, whom he sends in the place of said Sieur de Mézy; and to Talon [orders are sent] to take information, by means of persons not suspected of partiality, of the truth of the complaints made against him, and in case they be well founded, to arrest him, to prosecute and to complete his trial unto definitive judgment exclusively, and to send him afterwards a prisoner to France since this is a satisfaction the king deems due to his justice and to the peace of the people in these quarters.[35]

When Talon arrived in Quebec Mézy had been dead four months; the last part of the instructions had not to be carried out. Notwithstanding the assertion in the beginning of the instruction, the Jesuits had no hand in the selection of Mézy.[36] The various arbitrary acts of the governor, labelled by Colbert as "divers passions of anger and avarice," need not be recounted here, but, suffice it to note, the governor had endeavored to get the Jesuits of Quebec to take sides in his quarrel with the bishop, and although they strove to live at peace with both, without offending either, Mézy chose to look upon them as the leaders of the opposition. His secret memoirs addressed to Paris "excited suspicions which it was subsequently very difficult for some to lay aside." The contents of his memoirs are set forth by Charlevoix as well as the grounds which gave the accusations some color of truth:

---

[34] Cf. J.-E. Roy, *Rapport sur les Archives de France relatives à l'histoire du Canada,* Ottawa, 1911, 776.

[35] Louis XIV's instructions to Talon, March 27, 1665, AC, B 1:76-76v, AE, Mém. et Doc., *Amérique,* 5:146-146v, Clément, III², 391, RAPQ, 1931, 6, translation with slight changes from NYCD, IX, 25.

[36] Cf. Letter of Mézy to the Jesuits of Quebec, February 29, 1664, AC, F 3, 3:300, printed in Parkman, *Old Régime,* 415; [Soeur Françoise Juchereau de St. Ignace], *Histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec,* Montauban, [1751], 148-149; Faillon, III, 67, 98; Eastman, 66.

> He had insisted especially and strongly on the great influence which the Jesuits had in the colony; and as the court had hitherto scarcely interfered in the affairs of New France, which it had in some sort abandoned to the Canada Company, and as the Relations annually received from that country, and widely circulated, spoke much of those missionaries, whose functions obliged them to enter into all matters that concerned the Indians, many persons were convinced that the governor's complaints were not unfounded: they judged what was by what might be, and concluded that men who enjoyed so great an influence would, naturally speaking, use every endeavor to preserve it, and might at times abuse it.[37]

Among the persons whose suspicions were aroused was the minister, who, it has been said, recognized power when he saw it. The last words of Charlevoix' quotation give the real state of affairs. Naturally speaking, the Jesuits might abuse their power, might prefer theirs to that of the king, might even overshadow royal authority and set it at nought. But between this possibility and the actual seizure of power, there was a wide difference. Charlevoix is here expressing what was in the mind of Colbert and of the king, namely, that there might be an abuse, a fact clear from subsequent instructions given to the governors and intendants. In each one the possibility is mentioned, but nowhere, in spite of assertions by writers with a thesis to prove, is the too great temporal authority of the Jesuits positively asserted as actual by either the king or the minister. Charlevoix continues:

> M. Colbert, accordingly, deemed it necessary to recall him [Mézy], reserving to himself to take precautions to limit the power of the ecclesiastics and missionaries in case it was shown

---

[37] Charlevoix, III, 175.

> it went too far; and in this view, he prepared to select for the colony officers of a character not to give any ground of exception in their conduct, and who would not suffer any to share with them an authority with which it behooved them to be invested exclusively.[38]

The memoirs of Mézy are thus the source of the oft repeated accusation of preponderant authority the Jesuits had acquired in Canada. The contents of these memoirs can be judged from the request presented by Father Le Mercier to Tracy, Courcelle, and Talon, begging these officials to have a juridical investigation made of the charges. The Jesuit asked for an inquiry in order to find out

> Whether it be true that the Bishop and the Jesuit Fathers are secretly and cleverly enriching themselves by selling brandy to the Indians for their peltries . . . ; that the Jesuit Fathers will not allow the Indians to be ruled by the laws of His Majesty, in which disobedience they find great advantages . . . ; that the religion of the Indians exists only in imagination; that they are only become Christians through expediency and because of the presents made to them; beyond this show of Christianity they are as deeply sunk in their errors as they were before, and they practice them everyday.

"If to become a criminal, it is enough to be accused, there is not one innocent man in the world," said Father Le Mercier. The accuser should prove his accusation or be declared a calumniator and treated as such. All he asked was that the truth be made manifest, and "our Society, here and in France, purged of the calumnies" sent to the mother country by the Sieur de Mézy. Tracy dissuaded the Jesuits from pursuing this affair and from demanding a public investigation and reparation "because these accusations are in a letter written to the king which is supposed to be secret, and they cannot be struck out, and secondly, because they [Tracy, Courcelle, and Talon] had written advantageously to His Majesty for our justification. So all is well."[39]

---

[38] *Ibid.,* cf. *Relations inédites,* xxiv.

[39] Rochemonteix, II, 528-530, printed the document in full.

SECTION 2. DURING TALON'S TWO TERMS

All was not well. It is a pity Father Le Mercier allowed himself to be dissuaded by Tracy from having the matter investigated. The justification sent by the three officials, as the sequel proved, did not have the same effect as a judicial investigation would have had, especially with judges as able and as different as Tracy and Talon.[1] The letter of Tracy spoken of by Father Le Mercier has not been found, but he certainly wrote,[2] and he spoke to the king and to Colbert upon his return to France.[3] There are not enough letters of Courcelle to form an opinion. The letters of Talon, however, are extant, and his attitude toward the two questions, the too great authority of the Jesuits and the brandy trade, can be studied in his correspondence. In the king's instructions to the intendant before he left for Canada, we read:

> Sieur Talon will be informed, that those who have made the most faithful and disinterested report on the said Country, have always stated that the Jesuits, whose piety and zeal have considerably contributed to attract thither the people who are at present there,[4] have assumed an authority there that transcends the bounds of their true profession, which must regard only consciences. To maintain themselves therein, they were very glad to nominate the Bishop of Petraea, who was entirely dependent

---

[1] Cf. Talon to Colbert, October 4, 1665, AC, C 11A, 2:147v; RAPQ, 1931, 35; NYCD, IX, 32. Tracy ordered Mézy's accusations deleted from the registers of the Sovereign Council, Faillon, III, 162. It is difficult to follow Eastman's reasoning in this connection. "He [Mézy] was making secret accusations against the Jesuits . . . and it is possible that the missing documents were intended to substantiate the charges contained in his letters to the king," Eastman, 68. There was no need of documents for substantiation of some of the charges. If the bishop and the Jesuits had carried on an open brandy trade in Quebec, could "such a state of affairs have escaped the sharp eye of Talon?" as Eastman himself asks further down, 87. Owing to the destruction of Mézy's papers, "justice was never done him," R. D. Cahall, *The Sovereign Council of New France,* New York, 1915, 33, is readily granted, if justice done to a calumniator is thereby meant.

[2] Mary of the Incarnation, 239, Colbert to Talon, April 5, 1666, AC, C 11A, 2:206v; RAPQ, 1931, 46; NYCD, IX, 44. Cf. Rochemonteix, II, 381, note 2, quoting the letter of thanks of the General to Tracy.

[3] Colbert to Talon, February 20, 1668, AC, C 11A, 3:12v; RAPQ, 1931, 93.

[4] Cf. Salone, *La Colonisation de la Nouvelle-France,* 66-73.

on them,[5] to discharge the Episcopal functions, and they have nominated[6] even up to the present time, the King's governors in that country, where they have made use of all appliances possible to have those recalled who had been chosen for that office without their participation;[7] so that it being absolutely necessary to preserve in a just equilibrium the temporal authority resident in the person of the king and in those who represent him and the Spiritual, which resides in the person of the said Bishop and Jesuits, in such a manner always as that the latter be subordinate to the former, the first thing Sieur Talon shall well observe and on which it is proper that he have correct ideas on leaving here, is, to understand perfectly the actual position of these two authorities in the country, and that which they ought naturally to occupy.[8]

Clearly, the minister or the clerk who wrote these instructions had in mind what Mézy had written. The preceding year de Lionne had already warned Tracy to take care not to suffer the Jesuits to encroach on the authority confided to him by the king.[9] Talon was requested to annotate each of the articles of his instructions. That quoted above was the second, and his remark was:

---

[5] Cf. *supra,* page 75, note 28.

[6] Printing this section of Talon's instructions, Sulte grandiloquently asks: "Will any one dare deny this affirmation signed by Louis XIV and his minister Lionne?" Somebody did dare. A compatriot of Sulte, Thomas Chapais, who had a much better knowledge of the history of Canada, and who did not take his cue from Margry, showed that "in reality, no governor, not a single one, owed his nomination to the influence of, or friendship with the Jesuits," *Jean Talon,* 43. Sulte's verbiage stood him in lieu of proofs. He apparently labored under the illusion that the signature of Louis XIV made infallible pronouncements of every statement above it.

[7] "Did they have Champlain, who died in office, recalled? Did they have Montmagny recalled, who was recalled after twelve years, because the Court had declared not to leave governors so long in office? Did they have d'Ailleboust recalled who had been appointed for three years and who remained in office that length of time? Did they have Lauzon recalled, who left without orders from the king before his term expired? Was it not d'Argenson himself who asked Lamoignon to choose his successor? Had not d'Avaugour been recalled because of his conflict with Laval over the brandy trade? It is really regrettable that such thoughtless and inexact assertions should slip into a document bearing the royal signature," Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 44. With regard to subsequent recalls of governors, interesting sidelights are found in the following letters of M. Tronson to Remy, April 27, 1684, n. 246, to Dollier, May 1, 1689, n. 406, and to Belmont, May 30, 1690, n. 420. Cf. also Dudouyt to Laval, May 26, 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 62, Dudouyt is speaking of the recall of Frontenac.

[8] Mémoire du roi pour servir d'instruction à Talon, March 27, 1665, AC, B 1:75-76v; AE, Mém. et Doc., *Amérique,* 5:145-145v; RAPQ, 1931, 5; NYCD, IX, 24.

> To answer to the second article. . . . I say that the short time I have been in Canada has not yet enabled me to acquire a perfect knowledge of the conduct the Jesuits have followed in the past. However, having carefully observed whether they are at present using the spiritual authority to weaken the temporal authority which must reside only in those persons who represent the king, I have noticed they fairly well [assez] remain within the limits of their profession; and until now, I have not observed them anxious to meddle with public secular affairs.[10] Should their conduct in the future confirm or reverse my present opinion, I shall have the honor of letting the king know it. There is, however, reason to hope they will help to fulfill the intentions of His Majesty for the establishment of the Colony no less than they are actually fulfilling his intentions for the advancement of the glory of God. These are the two main purposes of His Majesty, and I believe, the two principal ends of my mission.[11]

Talon did not write differently to Colbert.[12] The minister expressed himself satisfied, and replied that His Majesty was very happy to learn both from Tracy and Talon how the Bishop of Petraea and the Jesuits have only in view the advancement of Christianity in the colony.[13] The Jesuits in Quebec were just as pleased with Talon as the intendant was with them. They praised him unanimously in their letters to the general of the Order, and he, Father Paul Oliva, sent a few words of congratulations to the intendant thanking him for his kindness toward his subordinates in New France.[14] Talon's reply has been preserved in the archives of the Order:

---

[9] NYCD, IX, 22; cf. AC, C 11A, 2:102v-103.

[10] Gratuitous assertions might be passed over, were it not that silence might be taken for acquiescence. If the Jesuits did have, for a time, a share in the civil government of the colony, who was responsible except the civil power itself? In 1647, when the Superior of the mission was made a member of the Council of Quebec, the Jesuits had not asked for it, and they doubted whether they should accept it, *Journal des Jésuites,* 93. In 1656, they appealed to the government in Paris, asking that the Superior be discharged of this function, *Correspondance échangée entre les autorités françaises et les gouverneurs et intendants,* Quebec, 1893, 104. In 1661, Governor d'Avaugour wrote to the Prince of Condé: "J'ay mis a la teste d'un conseil general pour le ceruisse du roy et le bien du peis le reuerend pere Ragnaust [Ragueneau] le quel a l'honneur d'estre connu de vostre Altesse et avec trois austres tous les iours deslibere des afaires publiques, par son merite i'ay creu ne pouvoir rien de mieus, sy locasion s'en ofre ie suplie uostre Alt. d'octoriser cette conduite et d'estre tout persuadé que les iésuites qui ont plus trauuaié pour le peis," cited in Rochemonteix, II, 527. The Jesuits themselves did their best to be rid of the honor, *Journal des Jésuites,* 302. Some Jesuits may have been avid of power, and Father Ragueneau was one of them, but their confrères were the first to blame them, Rochemonteix, II, 184, 197-198.

[11] RAPQ, 1931, 11.

[12] Talon to Colbert, October 4, 1665, AC, C 11A, 2:143; RAPQ, 1931, 32; NYCD, IX, 29; cf. Charlevoix, III, 84.

Very Reverend Father,

It would be a source of great consolation to me if the letter which you did me the honor to write had as much foundation in truth as it is kind and obliging. I receive so many tokens of urbanity from the Fathers of your Society in New France, and I make such small returns for their good will toward me that it is for me a source of confusion, especially after such signal testimonies of benevolence on your part. The future will perhaps enable me to make reparation for the past by rendering a few useful services to your Company. Its titles to my services are several:—its continual striving to promote the glory of God, the honor of the king, and establishment of the colony. It is not easy for me to make due acknowledgments on behalf of His Majesty and on my own for their care in this occupation. My first education received in their schools under their obliging care calls for all my gratitude.[15] If I had retained the fruits of the instruction they gave me, I would have the honor of sending you a latin letter. Although I have become a bad pupil of good masters, I still retain the will of being of service to your Society. This I beg you humbly to believe, and to be persuaded that I honor and respect you as much as I can.

Very Reverend Father, your most humble and
Most obedient servant

Talon.[16]

---

[13] Colbert to Talon, April 5, 1666, AC, C 11A, 2:206v; RAPQ, 1931, 46; NYCD, IX, 44.

[14] Rochemonteix, III, 84.

[15] According to Rochemonteix, III, 83, Talon went to the Jesuit *Collège de Clermont,* Paris.

[16] Talon to Oliva, November 10, 1666, ASJ, Gal. 110, III, 366-366v; Rochemonteix, III, 34, note 1, printed this letter, reprinted in BRH, XXXVII, 1931, 659.

When Talon wrote this letter to the General of the Jesuits, he had been more than a year in New France. The intendant had arrived imbued with family prejudices against the Jesuits.[17] He had been urged by Colbert to put an end to their "ambition" and to break the alleged spirit of domination of the missionaries.

After a few months in Quebec, in spite of his prejudices and notwithstanding the proddings of Colbert, Talon had enough courage and was honest enough to write the truth to king and minister. One year after his arrival, when he had become better acquainted with the conditions in the colony, Talon wrote to the General of the Jesuits in this wise: his subordinates' occupation concerned itself with the glory of God, the honor of the king, and the progress of the colony; it was his duty to inform the king of the good effects this Jesuit occupation had on the colony; and he himself, Talon, felt bound to acknowledge such good effects. There is not the slightest indication of insincerity on the part of the intendant in these letters. Yet, some have pointed out, three days after he wrote to the General of the Jesuits, the intendant wrote a letter to Colbert which reads quite differently. After having asked to be recalled because of ill health, and because he did not wish to remain in Canada without such help as Tracy had given, he continued:

> Well do I know that everybody is not pleased with my administration here; and this, coupled with my own indisposition, induces me to ask the king for my discharge. Should you wish to know who they are who may be dissatisfied with my conduct and wherefore, the Chevalier de Chaumont and the general agent of the Company will be able to acquaint you, and to inform you that if I would leave the Church on the footing of authority I found it, I should experience less trouble and more approbation.[18]

Eastman points to this passage for an expression of misunderstanding between Talon and Laval.[19] Chapais confesses his ignorance of what this misunderstanding might be, whether the intendant and the bishop differed with regard to the tithes or to the brandy trade. "At any rate, this complaint of Talon shows that already at the end of 1666 harmony was not perfect."[20] There is no reason for including the Jesuits in the "Church" spoken of by Talon. The intendant did not contradict himself after an interval of three days, for when he spoke of the Jesuits he called them by their name.

---

[17] Cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 4-7.

[18] Talon to Colbert, November 13, 1666, AC, C 11A, 2:228; RAPQ, 1931, 61; translation from NYCD, IX, 57, revised.

[19] Eastman, 104.

In his letter of November 13, 1666, Talon had proposed to Colbert as his successor, Octave Zapaglia, Sieur de Ressan, the secretary of Tracy.[21] Again in 1667, he said he would prepare Ressan to take over the duties of intendant when relief came.[22] The following day, August 26, 1667, Talon sent an autograph letter to the minister. Tracy was returning to France, and the intendant warned Colbert that

> What M. de Tracy will tell you . . . may give you the impression which, were you to act upon it, might determine you to issue some orders or regulations prejudicial to the service of the king with regard to the establishment of this colony. Until the arrival of my secretary [in France], I feel obliged very humbly to beg of you to suspend your decision with regard to what will be told you [by Tracy] concerning the Church, the authority of which far from diminishing has taken on new strength and has made itself so redoubtable, that, I dare say, as long as it remains as I see it now, you, my Lord, and those who will have the honor of serving under your orders here, will have much trouble to make the good intentions of His Majesty for the increase of this colony prevail. This increase will always be much retarded by the fear the Church has instilled, and whose rule might be said to be too despotic and overstepping the limits.[23]

This letter does not indicate in what respect the Church had overstepped the limits and had encroached upon royal authority. In October 1667, the intendant again wrote to Colbert but was not more specific. The example set by His Majesty of his respect for the Church, he said, will be imitated in Canada, and "I dare hope the interests of God will be taken care of in such a manner that you will hear no complaints, that is, just complaints, because I know how baseless recriminations may be sent you, above all by those who want to confuse what comes under the jurisdiction of the magistrates with what comes under that of the ecclesiastics, which I know you do not tolerate."[24] Chapais thinks that Talon still bore a grudge because of the *Sainte-Famille* affair, which had occurred during the Carnival of 1667.[25] The intendant had to retreat. Said Chapais: "If there was encroachment upon this occasion, it was encroachment of the civil on the spiritual powers."[26]

---

[20] Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 148.

[21] Talon to Colbert, November 13, 1666, AC, C 11A, 2:229v; RAPQ, 1931, 53.

[22] *Id.* to *id.,* August 25, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:298v-299; RAPQ, 1931, 74.

[23] *Id.* to *id.,* August 26, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:302-302v; RAPQ, 1931, 76.

Over and above this explanation by Chapais, clearly the brandy question had caused a change of front on the part of Talon. The intendant "partially conditioned the prosperity of new France on the brandy trade."[27] He resented any opposition to what he believed tended to increase the wealth of the colony. He apparently failed to see that the sale of brandy to the Indians might not in the long run be beneficial even to the material interests of Canada. Although the liquor traffic is not mentioned in his letter, it was, to his thinking, a matter which "came under the jurisdiction of the magistrates" exclusively. Yet, Talon was too intelligent to repeat the statement that ultimately the opposition to the traffic came from the Jesuits who controlled the bishop. The intendant knew Laval as a bishop who in this as in all other matters, would not accept a course of conduct dictated by others. Talon had written to Louis XIV and to Colbert that if the Jesuits—as distinguished from the other ecclesiastics of Canada—made any attempt to weaken the temporal authority or to meddle with public secular matters, he would not fail to let the king and the minister know, and Talon, we can rest assured, would not have hesitated to write accordingly if such had been the case in 1667.

In the same letter of October 27, 1667, the intendant had occasion to speak of the Jesuits. If they had been the "Church" he spoke about, he would have mentioned them specifically. In 1666 he had clashed with the missionaries in Quebec with regard to their land grant near the town. In virtue of the king's eminent domain, Talon had appropriated some of this land to form three villages. He wrote to Colbert:

---

[24] *Id.* to *id.*, October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:315v; RAPQ, 1931, 83.

[25] Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 195.

[26] Chapais, *The Great Intendant,* Toronto, 1914, 87.

[27] Rochemonteix, III, 86-87, cf. Gosselin, II, 80.

> I do not know how I stand with the Jesuit Fathers since I dispelled their hopes that the seignory of the lands which I took from them to form these villages would turn to their advantage. I know, however, they are sorry, but they have [enough] prudence not to show it.'[28]

The Jesuits had asked for confirmation of a land concession they possessed near Montreal, the Prairie de la Madeleine. Talon, in the same letter says he had granted it to them after conferring with Courcelle. All that was needed was the king's ratification:

> It depends on you, my Lord, to grant it to them; I think you can do this without any injury to his Majesty's interests, unless the tract seems to you too large [two by four leagues], but they should be obliged to secure letters patent from His Majesty on account of the hospice they wish to build on this concession.[29]

All these letters were brought to Colbert at the end of 1667 or the beginning of 1668 by Patoulet.[30] "Your secretary," wrote the minister, "has arrived and has given me your memoir of October 27, together with your notices of the 25, 26, and 27 of the same month as well as another memoir containing all the things which you deem necessary for Canada in the present state of affairs of that colony."[31]

---

[28] Talon to Colbert, October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:309v; RAPQ, 1931, 79.

[29] *Id.* to *id.,* October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:309v; RAPQ, 1931, 79. On the hospice referred to by Talon, cf. Memoire de la main de M. de Tracy sur le Canada, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:327v.

[30] Memoire a resoudre pour le Canada, AC, C 11A, 2:9. Regarding this document see next note.

[31] Colbert to Talon, February 10, 1668, AC, C 11A, 3:11. A few words about this letter of Colbert will clarify what is said in the text. It was undoubtedly dictated to a scribe who used special abbreviations, a kind of shorthand, and is almost undecipherable. The version in RAPQ, 1931, 91 ff. was very helpful, but there are passages in which another reading seemed preferable. By the memoir of October 27, Colbert meant the letter of Talon, AC, C 11A, 2:306-320v, RAPQ, 1931, 77-86. There does not seem to be letters extant of Talon for the 25, 26, and 27 of the "same month," but there are

A passage in this letter of Colbert refers to the Sieur de Ressan. In view of what will be said about a memoir attributed to Talon, it seems well to give in detail all the references to the Jesuits in the intendants' letters for 1666 and 1667.

Colbert had previously written to Talon about de Ressan, the successor the intendant had in view, telling him to have Ressan send a memoir to Paris.

> In order that I might know his character by myself. Have him send me an account of the state of affairs in the colony, with the means he thinks practical to better and increase it. From his account I shall be able to form my judgment on his capacity, whether he possesses the needed qualities to govern people. But the suggestion to write to me must appear as if it came from you, without letting him know it is I who desired him to write.[32]

With Colbert, the administration of France and New France came before every other consideration. Talon had insistently asked leave to return to France. Although the minister had the highest regard for Talon, he likely thought the intendant in his eagerness to go back to France might have overrated the qualities of the Sieur de Ressan. Apparently Ressan sent his views to Colbert. After reading the memoir, the minister wrote to Talon:

> As I [always] give to the king an account of everything, I cannot fail to inform him of the essential points of this memoir, and his Majesty judged that he [Ressan] showed too much animosity against the Bishop of Petraea and the Jesuits. There is

---

two letters of August 25, and 26, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:298-301v, and 302-303v, respectively, RAPQ, 1931, 74-77. The "other memoir" spoken of by the minister is Talon's memoir of October 29, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:322-325v; RAPQ, 1931, 87-88. The only letter not accounted for is the second letter of October 27. It seems plausible that the scribe misunderstood the minister, or that the latter's dictation was faulty. In this volume of the *Correspondance Générale,* just before the dictated letter, there is a document in the handwriting of Colbert entitled by the minister: Memoire a resoudre pour le Canada. Il est necessaire que le Roy ait la bonte de repondre promptement aux articles de ce memoire attendu que les vaisseaux qui vont en ce pays la doibvent partir au mois de mars prochain, AC, C 11A, 3:8-9. The items of this memorandum are taken from the four letters and memoirs of Talon of August 25, 26, October, 27, 29.

[32] Colbert to Talon, April 6, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:290v. On O. Zapaglia, Sieur de Ressan, cf. *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXVIII, 1922, 74.

no likelihood of the intendancy of a distant country like Canada being given to a man with such a turn of mind, all the less since, even though all he advances were true, and there is much that is doubtful, it would not be prudent to bring up again an evil which has been, for no matter what his remedy might be, it would always have worse effects than the evil itself. The duty of a governor and of an intendant must consist in tempering this evil [three or four illegible words] without irritating it and without having recourse to extreme measures against the said Bishop of Petraea and the said Jesuit Fathers, even if they had abused the power which their garb and the respect people naturally have for religion gives them. [The remedy should rather consist] in private conferences with them, tending to limit their power as much as can be, confining them within the bounds of their legitimate authority. There is hope that when the country shall be more populated . . . the authority of the king will prevail over the other [spiritual], and will easily confine the spiritual within its just limits. To which I shall only add that it would be against common sense to irritate the king with the ideas of Sr. de Ressan, secretary of M. de Tracy, for these ideas are entirely opposed, or better, entirely contrary to those [expressed] by the said Sieur de Tracy.[33]

The present writer has not found any memoir whose author is indisputably Ressan. But there is a memoir which has been dated 1667 and attributed to Talon, and this contained the type of "animosity against the Bishop of Petraea and the Jesuits" referred to by Colbert in his letter to the intendant. A brief criticism of authorship and date of this memoir is important because of the use some writers made of it. It will be shown that it was certainly composed at a later date, and that the author of the memoir, whoever he may be, was not Talon.

It was first published in 1840 by the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec from a copy brought to Canada by Lord Durham. According to a note in the margin of the document, said the editor, "it is evident that it was composed by Talon, who, in 1667, was intendant of justice, police, and finances in Canada."[34] With regard to the date and the author, Chapais wrote: "This memoir has been attributed to Talon by our [Canadian] historians, Garneau and Ferland, as well as by Parkman. . . . In spite of some doubts which presented themselves to our mind, we follow the common opinion, and we hold Talon as the author of this memoir."[35] But, said Chapais, the marginal date is faulty. Instead of 1667, which the copyist read, he should have read 1669, that is, when Talon was making himself ready to return to Canada for his second term as intendant. From internal evidence the historian of the great intendant then shows the document to have been wrongly dated. He quotes from the subdivision of the memoir labelled "War," which reads:

---

[33] Colbert to Talon, February 20, 1668, AC, C 11A, 3:12v; RAPQ, 1931, 93. Cf. in the same letter, f. 14v. RAPQ, 1931, 94, the recommendation the minister makes to Talon to warn Courcelle not to imitate Sieur de Ressan; cf. Garneau, I, 199.

> The said troops, four companies of seventy-five men each, officers included, are distributed as follows: In Montreal, spearhead of the colony, two companies. A Fort St. Louis on the Richelieu River, two other companies from which thirty men have been detatched [to man] Fort Ste. Anne, the most advanced outpost toward the Iroquois country, and twenty men, plus a sergeant [have been detached to man] Fort St. Jean.[36]

But, argued Chapais, until the fall of 1668, there were twenty-four companies of soldiers in Canada, namely, the four regular companies of colonial troops, and the twenty companies of the Carignan regiment. As this unit went back to France in the fall of 1668,[37] obviously the document was written after this date. If Talon had written or dictated the memoir in 1667, he would not have omitted to mention the twenty companies of the crack regiment.

A further examination of the document reveals that it was undoubtedly written in 1669. When Talon was ordered to return to Canada for his second term, he requested: "That similarly funds be set aside for this year's [1669] subsistance of the four companies of seventy-five men each, officers included, which remained in Canada."[38]

---

[34] *Collection de Mémoires et de Relations sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada,* published by the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, Quebec, 1840, II, n. 1, reprinted in 1873; again printed as a part of Talon's correspondence in RAPQ, 1931, 63-66.

[35] *Jean Talon,* 196, n. 1.

[36] RAPQ, 1931, 66.

[37] Cf. Colbert to Talon, April 5, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:291; RAPQ, 1931, 68; Talon to Colbert, October 29, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:322; RAPQ, 1931, 87; Memorandum of Colbert, 1668, AC, C 11A, 3:8.

Besides, the section of the anonymous memoir entitled "Nobility" reads as follows:

> The nobility is composed of four ancient noblemen and of four other heads of families whom the king honored *last year* with letters of nobilities.
>
> Beside this number, there may be a few more noblemen among the officers who have settled in the country. As this small number is not considerable enough to uphold, as they are naturally obliged to do, the authority of the king and his interests in all things, my sentiment is that it would be increased by eight more selected from among the most meritorious and best intentioned persons, leaving the names [on the letters of nobility] in blank as it was done last year.[39]

The four heads of families spoken of are Godefroyd, Denys, Amyot and Le Moyne.[40] The letters of nobility were granted to these well deserving Canadians by the king in 1668.[41]

From external evidence, nothing can be deduced as to authorship or date.[42] The document, nine and a half pages long, is in the hand of a copyist without signature or date. The title reads: *Memoire sur l'Estat present du Canada.*[43] On the upper left-hand corner, a later hand added in pencil, *M. Talon, Canada.* This is the only external indication of authorship. Contrary to Chapais' belief, based on the word of the editor of the copy brought to Canada by Lord Durham, there is no date in the margin. In the volume of the *Correspondance Générale,* it is found between an anonymous memoir protesting against Talon's plan to form a company of Canadians for the monopoly of trade,[44] and another memoir,[45] the last one in this volume, which was written after 1710.[46]

---

[38] Memoir of Talon on Canada, 1669, AC, C 11A, 3:49-49v; RAPQ, 1931, 99.

[39] AC, C 11A, 2:358-358v; RAPQ, 1931, 65.

[40] Talon to Colbert, October 29, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:324-324v; RAPQ, 1931, 88; *id.* to *id.,* November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:110v; RAPQ, 1931, 138-139. Letters of nobility were granted to a fifth Canadian, the Sieur Dupont, spoken of in this letter of Talon in May 1669, AC, B 1, 129-130v; BRH, XXXIII, 1927, 129-130; they were engrossed in the registers of the Sovereign Council, March 24, 1670, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 601. Tracy had also proposed a list of honors after his return to France, AC, C 11A, 2:328-329, AC, C 11A, 3:8v; those whom Talon recommended were ennobled.

[41] Cf. [Daniel], *Histoire des grandes familles françaises du Canada,* Montreal, 1867, 153, the decree ennobling Le Moyne.

[42] AC, C 11A, 2:355-359v.

[43] The title given in RAPQ, 1931, 63, *Mémoire de Talon sur l'état présent du Canada, (1667),* begs the question.

A comparison of this anonymous document with Talon's memoir of 1669 shows that whoever wrote the first had access to the latter. Beyond some definite items which the anonymous writer culled from Talon's memoir,[47] clearly the memorialist only had a vague knowledge of the state of affairs in Canada. Chapais wrote of his doubts about the authorship of the anonymous document,[48] but he did not state the reasons for his doubts. Well may one question Talon's authorship when one reads the opening paragraph:

> Canada is a vast country of different latitudes capable in its various climates and sun exposures of producing without exception all that France produces, having like France a warm climate in the south, a cold climate in the north and in the middle a temperate climate between these two extremes.[49]

It is difficult to imagine Talon beginning a memoir for perusal by the king and Colbert and this when he was ready to go back to New France for his second term of office as intendant, with such childish commonplaces. The entire first division of the memoir is in keeping with the introductory lines. Everything is vague, indetermined, general, in strong contrast to the clear, pointed, and specific writing of the intendant in documents unquestionably his own. Talon's primary function was the administration of justice in the colony. The author of the memoir evinces a jejune knowledge of this branch of colonial government, and, startling enough, says there is little to amend in the administration of justice, "if the king by his authority had the code observed." Talon had charge of the police and finances, yet the memoir mentions neither. Added to these cardinal facts is a charge against the clergy of Canada which takes up one-third of the memoir and, moreover, reveals the "animosity" of the Ressan memoir so deprecated by Colbert in his letter to Talon. When all is taken into consideration, only one conclusion can be drawn—the memoir was not written, or composed, or dictated by Talon. Nowhere in his correspondence is there found anything approaching the "animosity" shown in this memoir.[50] The author, it would appear, was bent upon airing some views about the clergy of Canada. He had a few items of information gathered from Talon's memoir of 1669, and around these he wrought some elaborate embroidering until the picture of the Jesuits engaged in their commerce, hampering the consciences of the faithful, and encroaching like the clergy on the royal authority, stood forth clearly enough to suit whatever purpose he had in mind.

---

[44] Memoire sur le commerce du Canada et sur la proposition faite par M. Talon de former une compagnie de gens du Pays po. faire seuls le commerce, AC, C 11A, 2:351-354v.

[45] Observations faittes par Delino Conseiller au Conseil Superieur de Quebec sur les difficultez qui se rencontrent en ce pays dans l'Execution de certains articles des Ordonnances de 1667. 1669. Et 1681. avec quelque Remarques sur lesquelles il seroit tres apropos de statüer, AC, C 11A, 2:360-370v.

[46] Some one dated this memoir 1667. "Comme la chose est arrivée une ou deux fois du temps de Monsieur Raudot; Et une fois depuis son départ," AC, C 11A, 2:362v. The younger Raudot left Canada in 1710; his father left in 1711.

[47] Compare AC, C 11A, 37, RAPQ, 1931, 108, with AC, C 11A, 2:356v, RAPQ, 1931, 64; f. 49-49v, p. 99 with f. 359, p. 66; f. 51, p. 100, with f. 357, p. 64; f. 51v, p. 100, with ff. 358-358v, p. 65; f. 52, p. 100, with ff. 357-357v, p. 64-65; etc.

[48] *Jean Talon,* 196, note 1.

[49] AC, C 11A, 2:355; RAPQ, 1931, 63.

For the king and for Colbert who were so much in touch with clerical affairs in Canada, the memorialist's description must have been enlightening.

> The clergy of Canada is composed of a bishop, having under him nine priests and several clerics, and of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, thirty-five in number, most of whom are employed in the Indian missions. This work is worthy of their zeal and of their piety, if they are exempt from the self-interest to which, *people say,* they are not averse, witness the trade which, *people assure,* they carry on in the Ottawa country and at the

---

[50] Cf. Talon's annotations to the instructions given by the king, AC, C 11A, 3:39; RAPQ, 1931, 110, and the memoir he sent to Colbert, November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:85v-87; RAPQ, 1931, 126-127.

Cap de la Madeleine; of this, however, I have *no certain knowledge.*[51]

The memorialist apparently had no certain knowledge of a number of things a former intendant should have had. Talon had visited the Cap de la Madeleine in the fall of 1667, he had seen everybody, talked to every one,[52] but had not mentioned the Jesuits as tradesmen. Evidently he did not hear "people say" such things. Nowhere else in the intendant's correspondence can there be found even so much as an allusion to trade carried on by the Jesuits, either at the Cap de la Madeleine, in the Ottawa country, or in any other part of New France.

The rest of this section of the anonymous memoir deals with the "ecclesiastics" of Canada and is on a par with the paragraph pertaining to the Jesuits, except in the treatment of the Sulpicians, who found grace and favor in the eyes of the writer. The manner of life of all these priests—diocesan clergy and Jesuits—for all that appears exteriorly is well regulated, we are told. They would wish every one in the colony to imitate them but this is not possible; those who do not conform to their way of life, who do not think as they do, who do not bow under their authority, "which they extend even over temporal affairs, meddling with external regulations which are of the province of the civil magistrate," those then who disagree with these ecclesiastics in such matters easily incur their ill-will.

There is ground to suspect . . . that they aim to share the temporal authority, which will until the arrival of the troops in Canada resided principally in them. To this evil which goes so far as to hamper and constrain the consciences of the people . . . a remedy may be applied in order to counterbalance with moderation and skill such authority by that which resides in those persons sent by His Majesty to govern the colony, which has already been done, in allowing them to send back to France one or two ecclesiastics who show less respect for that temporal authority, and whose conduct in this matter is the cause of the great disturbance in the colony; in admitting four ecclesiastics, secular or regular, with full power to administer the sacraments undisturbed, else they would be useless to the colony, for if they did not conform to what those who are here now do, the bishop would forbid them to administer the sacraments. To be better informed of the constraining of the consciences, M. Dubois, chaplain of the Carignan regiment who heard several confessions secretly and by stealth, may be consulted, as well as M. de Bretonvilliers, with regard to what he heard from the priests of his seminary of Montreal.[53]

---

[51] AC, C 11A, 2:356-356v; RAPQ, 1931, 64. Italics inserted. A blank space was left by the memorialist for the number of the Jesuits in Canada, to be filled in probably when he had a "more certain knowledge." Cf. for the number of Jesuits in Canada, Talon's memoir, L'etat du Canada en general, 1669, AC, C 11A, 3:37; RAPQ, 1931, 108.

[52] "They are bringing to you the most exact possible census of all the inhabitants of all age and sex who are in this colony. *I myself took it* at Montreal, Three Rivers, and *at the Cap de la Madeleine,* as well as at all the places which are above Quebec. *I went from door to door to every house,*" Talon to Colbert, October 27, 1667, AC, C 11A, 2:311v; RAPQ, 31, 80. Italics inserted. The intendant "went from house to house throughout the whole Island [of Montreal] in order to inquire from each of the inhabitants, even from the poorest, whether they were treated with justice and equity, and in order to see if the poverty of some required his liberalities and his alms," Dollier de Casson, *Histoire du Montréal,* 109.

Strangely enough, nowhere else is there any allusion to these priests, disturbers of colonial peace, who had so little respect for the temporal authority residing in the persons sent by His Majesty to govern the colony. That Talon resented the opposition of Laval to the brandy trade need not be elaborated, and that the torturing of the consciences and the encroachment on civil authority by the ecclesiastics consisted purely and simply in the uncompromising attitude of the diocesan clergy and the Jesuits with regard to the same traffic is clear from the previous and subsequent actions of the intendant, but that he wrote the memoir analyzed in the previous pages is hardly conceivable.

After Mézy had broken with Laval, the disorders caused by the brandy trade reappeared.[54] By tolerating the commerce, the governor knew he would vex the bishop and the Jesuits. Tracy enforced the orders of the king with regard to the traffic;[55] whereas Courcelle acted less energetically than the Viceroy Tracy, when the latter departed for

---

[53] AC, C 11A, 2:356v-357; RAPQ, 1931, 64.

[54] *Journal des Jésuites,* 323; *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 174, 181.

[55] *Journal des Jésuites,* 353; AC, C 11A, 2:171-171v; *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 368.

France. The governor was in favor of the trade. It was the uncompromising stand of the Jesuits which caused his ill-will toward them once Tracy was gone.[56] From then on, there was nobody to check the ardor of the two officials, Courcelle and aTlon. Talon's ideas prevailed, and later the intendant was said to be the cause of the renewed brandy traffic troubles, "inasmuch as the day he was ready to leave for France, he ordered the removal of all the penalties and ordinances, of which the tribunals and those who had wielded the authority in the colony had made use to repress the disorders caused by the too great quantity of liquor given to the Indians which for thirty years had always been opposed by ordinances, fines, etc."[57]

Commerce was uppermost in the mind of Talon and its moral aspects did not trouble him very much. He gradually changed his mind with regard to the brandy trade, becoming more affected by the specious arguments and immediate advantages of the traffic, and less bothered by the moral evils flowing from it. His opposition to the brandy trade on beginning his term is evidenced by his signing the ordinances against it,[58] although like the good Gallican he was, Talon considered the excommunication previously launched against the traffickers an encroachment on the civil power. Through his growing influence,[59] the Council became more and more reluctant in prosecuting the offenders.[60] The climax came on the eve of his sailing for France.[61] Talon assembled the Sovereign Council, and had it annul—which, it must be said, the members did most willingly[62]—all previous ordinances, life penalties, and declare trade in liquor with the Indians open to all the French inhabitants of New France.[63] The Council, quite in favor of the trade, manifested its distaste for disorders by forbidding the Indians to get drunk.[64] Laval naturally refused to sign such a decree.[65] It was indeed quite naïve on the part of the members of the Council to expect the Indians to be moderate, since all they sought was precisely granted, namely, enough brandy for complete intoxication; thus inebriated they committed crimes and thought they could plead irresponsibility for any act committed while under the influence of liquor,[66] for they willfully got drunk to perpetrate all sorts of punishable offenses and crimes.[67] The ordinance caused such a recrudescence of disorders that Laval at Easter time, 1669, made the sale of brandy to the Indians a reserved case;[68] and, in June, the Council modified the brandy legislation once more. An ordinance was issued which forbade carrying brandy to the Indian villages, but allowed its sale to the Indians who came to buy it in the French settlements.[69]

---

[56] Lalemant to Oliva, February 12, 1668, quoted in Rochemonteix, III, 87, n. 1, "Moderatores politici [namely, the governor and the intendant] . . ."

[57] *Report on the Canadian Archives for 1885,* ci-ciii. Dudouyt is here referring to the ordinance of November 10, 1668, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 434.

[58] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 368, 474-476.

[59] *Ibid.,* I, 433-434, 447, 457-458, 531, but especially 448 and 449, and Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 234.

[60] The death penalty was replaced by fines and corporal punishment, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 368; investigations were ordered made about infractions, *ibid.,* 370-371, 373; contraventions were punished with confiscation of the liquor, *ibid.,* 410, or a small fine, *ibid.,* 422-423. There are no records of prosecution for violation of the ordinance of February 29, 1668, *ibid.,* 474-476, and yet it was not because violators were lacking, Faillon, III, 390-392.

[61] *Report on the Canadian Archives for 1885,* ci-ciii.

---

[62] The Council favored the freedom of the brandy trade in order that "les meillieurs habitans [puissent] beneficier du proffict qu'ils pourroient faire," rather than leave this profit to the coureurs de bois and others of their ilk, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 535. Dollier de Casson had also heard the excuse: "But I shall be told that if the brandy trade with the Indians is forbidden to the *gens de bien,* they will perish from hunger, cold and want and let all the profits go to conscientiousless men who will sell liquor without discretion," *Histoire du Montréal,* 114. Cf. in Faillon, III, 438-439, the letter of Villeray and Garribon to Colbert.

[63] La Tour, 85, claims that Talon had received a letter from Colbert directing the intendant to allow the freedom of the brandy trade. This is a gratuitous assertion for which there is no foundation. If the minister had given such directions he would not have failed to mention them in his instructions to Bouteroue or in his conversations with Dudouyt.

[64] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 534-536.

[65] Tilly, one of the Councillors, also refused to sign. Laval's refusal to sign the ordinance was his protest, Eastman, 128.

[66] "Among the Savages, drunken Persons are always excus'd: for the Bottle atones for all Crimes," Lahontan, *New Voyages,* I, 124. Cf. Lafitau, *Moeurs des Sauvages . . . ,* II, 486.

[67] Cf. Boucher, *Histoire veritable,* 98, 119; *Histoire de l'eau-de-vie,* 1; *Relations inédites,* II, 41, 42; Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* 426, etc.

[68] La Tour, 82. "We reserved to ourselves [the absolution] of the sin committed by those who make the Indians drunk, by those who sell or give liquor to take away in sufficient quantity to make them drunk, unless it is morally certain that these and their fellow Indians will not get drunk," *Mandements,* I, 77. This "reservation" was a further development of an episcopal declaration issued February 9, 1668, in which Laval reminded the people that "whatever reason obliged us to lift the excommunication [of 1660, and 1662], it may

Talon was replaced as intendant by Claude de Bouteroue. The latter's instructions with regard to the matter under consideration read: "With regard to the spiritual, notices received from Canada inform us that the Bishop of Petraea and the Jesuits exercised too harsh an authority through fear of excommunication, and too great austerity which they wish to impose upon the people." Bouteroue was to endeavor to temper this harshness, but never, on any account, must he blame either bishop or Jesuits, because this would render him practically useless in the service of the king.

> The commerce of wine and brandy with the Indians, called liquor trade, has been a subject of perpetual disputes between the Bishop of Petraea, the Jesuits, and the influential inhabitants, and those who traffic in that colony. The bishop and the Jesuits have maintained that these drinks intoxicate the Indians, that they are never moderate in drinking; that drunkenness makes them lazy in hunting, and is the cause of every sort of bad habit prejudicial to both religion and state.[70]
> The principal inhabitants and traffickers contend, on the contrary, that the desire to have liquor in exchange for their pelts forces them to go hunting with more diligence.[71] The intendant must carefully examine the two contentions, and send his reasoned opinion to the king.[72]

---

have been thought that all prohibition under pain of mortal sin was also lifted. Such has never been our intention." The grievousness of the sin, said the bishop, comes from its circumstances, namely, the lack of self-control of the Indians when there was liquor to be had, and the fearful consequences attending their drunkenness, *ibid.,* 72-73.

[69] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 558-559. It was not on account of the disorders that the Council modified its ordinance, but because the profits went to those who traded in the woods.

[70] These words of Colbert were to find their way in the ordinance of June 26, 1669, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 558.

[71] The Council in its ordinance of February 29, 1668, signed by Courcelle and Talon, said just the opposite, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 475.

[72] Instructions to Bouteroue, April 6, 1668, Clément, III^2, 404-405; cf. Charlevoix, III, 120-121.

Two remarks may here be made concerning this passage of Bouteroue's instructions. Colbert was misleading rather than enlightening the incoming intendant. Many of the principal inhabitants were of one mind with the bishop and the Jesuits in this matter,[73] and until this date the Sovereign Council had always supported a policy of repression, and Talon himself, in February, 1668, had signed a stringent ordinance against the brandy peddlers.[74] Secondly, Colbert had not yet arrived at any decision with regard to the brandy trade, since Talon had not yet reached Paris.

Bouteroue wielded no such influence with the Council as Talon had. From a letter of Colbert to Courcelle, the intendant's sympathies seemingly were with those who opposed the traffic.[75] He did not remain long in New France. Louis XIV and Colbert had recognized in Talon one of the few persons who could make Canada a great, strong, prosperous colony. They lost no time in sending the intendant back to New France. He arrived in Paris in December, 1668, and the letter of the king notifying Bouteroue of Talon's return is dated April 3, 1669.[76] Toward the end of his first term, Mary of the Incarnation had written: "Since Talon came here as intendant, the country has been more developed, more progress has been made, than during the whole time which has elapsed since the arrival of the French to Canada."[77] The same testimony is rendered by the superior of the Jesuits in Quebec: "He did not cease to devote all his care for the good of the whole commonwealth."[78] And in truth, agriculture, industry, commerce, exploration, received a strong impulse from Talon's tireless, energetic, "American" activity. The progress made during his first term determined Louis XIV to send him back to Canada for another two years "hoping that this length of time will be sufficient to achieve all that is necessary for the good and the advantage of that colony."[79]

---

[73] Cf. the petitions of the inhabitants of Cap de la Madeleine and Three Rivers, April 29, 1665, AC, C 11A, 2:171-171v; *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 340, 474.

[74] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 474-476.

[75] Colbert to Courcelle, May 15, 1669, Clément, III^2, 450, cf. *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 558.

[76] AC, B 1:117-117v.

[77] Mary of the Incarnation, 634.

[78] *Jesuit Relations,* 51, 170.

The intendant had carte blanche to send back to France by the first returning ship any and all obstructionists of what was "to the advantage of the colony and the good of the king's service."[80] The opposition of the bishop, the clergy, and the Jesuits to the brandy trade was, in Talon's mind, disadvantageous to the colony, but he knew there was no question of packing off to France Laval, his priests, and the Jesuits. Hence some other solution was to be found. Less rigid spiritual directors would be secured.

The year before, an article in Bouteroue's instructions read: "He must prevent as much as possible too great a number of priests, religious and nuns in Canada. It is enough to have a sufficient number of them to care for the spiritual needs of the settlers and for the administration of the sacraments."[81] To avoid the evident contradiction between the recommendation given to Bouteroue and the dispatch of new ecclesiastics a few months later, the argument of the two great authority, the harshness in the confessional of those in the colony was put forward. This measure was undoubtedly fathered by Talon, aware of M. de Queylus' preaching "that it was a mortal sin to give brandy to the Indians, because they only want liquor to get drunk."[82] Talon had also come to realize, when he was in Montreal in the early summer of 1667, that the Sulpicians would be at one with the clergy and the Jesuits on the brandy question. Consequently, when he agreed to return to Canada in 1669, he addressed a memoir to the king containing numerous requests made "in order that the intendant's service be as useful as His Majesty might desire." He petitioned to have the king's pleasure made known with regard to each article. Two of these articles read:

---

[79] Louis XIV to Talon, May 15, 1669, AC, B 1:130; RAPQ, 1931, 102.

[80] Louis XIV to Talon, May 15, 1669, AC, B 1:132; RAPQ, 1931, 101-102. A similar blanket order was prepared in 1668, March 2, AE, Mém. et Doc., *Amérique,* 5:242v, unless the date of this document, a copy, is faulty.

[81] Instruction pour M. de Bouteroue, April 6, 1668, AC, B 1:89, Clément, III^2, 405.

[82] *Journal des Jésuites,* 233.

Send four good religious who do not constrain nor torment consciences. It cannot be enough emphasized how essential this is for the development of the colony which suffers much for the lack of such priests. Leave to M. de Bretonvilliers to send each year, two or three carefully picked ecclesiastics to take care of Montreal and neighboring places.[83]

It was the old Roman maxim, *divide et impera.* Talon's choice fell upon the Recollects as possible soothers of consciences. For the past forty years, they had been longing to return to the field of their former missionary labors. It is not within the scope of this study to comment upon their willingness to give their support to the civil authorities in a matter which clearly was of the province of morality. They were heralded by the civil officials before their arrival as chosen opponents of the bishop, his clergy, and the Jesuits; still they were kindly received by those whom they were to oppose.[84] Thereafter, there is not one mention in the letters of Talon, during his second term of office, of the consciences being tortured by the bishop, the clergy, and the Jesuits.[85] In his memoir of November 10, 1670, the intendant said the clergy will be greatly relieved by the arrival of the new laborers. After asking for the king's bounty on behalf of the Recollects, he petitioned for more recruits "for the more they are, the better the too entrenched authority of the first ecclesiastics will be counterbalanced." The provincial of the Recollects who had come to Canada to found the convent, and who after a two month stay was returning on the ship that had brought him over, was charged by Talon to tell Colbert of "the constraint which the Canadians had thus far endured, and how skillfully I had to act with the Church to safeguard the authority of king, the tranquility of the consciences in order to avoid giving the clergy any pretext to murmur against me."[86]

---

[83] Memoir of Talon, 1669, AC, C 11A, 3:52, RAPQ, 1931, 100-101. Colbert wrote *"bon"* in the margin.

[84] Talon's annotations to his instructions of May 18, 1669, AC, C 11A, 3:39v; RAPQ, 1931, 110; his memoir on Canada of November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:85-86; RAPQ, 1931, 126-127; cf. the answer of Colbert, February 1, 1671, in Clément, III², 517, RAPQ, 1931, 143. *Jesuit Relations,* 53, 26; La Tour, 200; Lalemant to Oliva, September 19, 1670, quoted in Rochemonteix, III, 90, note 1; Laval's letter granting faculties to the Recollects, November 10, 1670 in Sixte Le Tac, *Histoire Chronologique de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, 1888, *Appendix,* 185. Charlevoix, III, 148, Faillon, III, 200. Cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 321.

[85] On the alleged oppression of the consciences by the Jesuits, see Eastman, 25-26.

Whatever tranquillity the consciences experienced after the arrival of the Recollects, the brandy question was not solved.[87] The ordinance which forbade the sale of brandy outside the French settlements and intoxication of Indians in these same settlements, was, of course, illusory. The "exemplary punishment" inflicted by Courcelle on some violators[88] was insufficient to deter the liquor peddlers, for the profits were too great, and the risk of being caught very small. Dollier de Casson complained bitterly of the renewed disorders after Talon's return. To give brandy to the Indians, he wrote, was equivalent to giving a sword to a madman.

> Consider before God, whether brandy should be distributed without any restriction, and whether he who gives it and he who receives it will not be treated alike by that redoubtable Judge at the hour of death, which will bring a great shock to all those who are here daily and deliberately cooperating in this sin without the slightest concern. Certain casuists may say what they please, but I do not believe that the boldest would want to die immediately after having supplied an Indian with enough brandy to intoxicate him, which is the same thing as inevitably to make him drunk and cause him to fall into mortal sin, according to the scripture: Woe to him through whom scandal comes![89]

SECTION 3. DURING FRONTENAC'S TERM

Talon had been sent to New France for two years.[1] At the end of this time, owing to ill health and to difficulties with Courcelle, he asked to be recalled.[2] Both the intendant and the governor returned to France on the same ship, 1672. Frontenac, Courcelle's successor, also held the brandy trade necessary as a source of revenue for the royal treasury, for the development of commerce and industry, and for the general prosperity of the colony. The traffic was an indispensable means to attach the Indians to the French, and to prevent them from selling their pelts to the English and Dutch.

---

[86] Talon's memoir on Canada, November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:86-86v; RAPQ, 1931, 126-127.

[87] Cf. *Histoire Chronologique de la Nouvelle France, Appendix,* 200, 202, 203.

[88] Margry, I, 189, NYCD, IX, 84. There is, in *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 544, one sentence passed against a Huron woman who became intoxicated; she was not condemned because she got drunk, but because while drunk she had slandered some persons.

[89] *Histoire du Montréal,* 114, cf. Mary of the Incarnation, 642.

[1] Louis XIV to Talon, May 15, 1669, AC, B 1:130; RAPQ, 1931, 102.

By 1673 the article of the ordinance of 1669 which prohibited carrying brandy to the Indian villages had become a dead letter; the number of coureurs de bois had increased; liquor was being peddled even in the farthest recesses of the then known New France. This recrudescence led the priests to remind the people that giving brandy to the Indians was a reserved sin and that the declaration of the bishop was still in vigor. Frontenac complained to the minister of a Jesuit who took this as the subject of his sermon, an altogether inopportune reminder, he wrote, for "only two weeks before I had forbidden, under stronger penalties than any other governor ever issued before, bringing brandy to the Indians."[3] Later in the same letter he requested a decision to be rendered while Laval was in Paris, because this refusal of absolution "extremely hampers the consciences. I have told them [the Jesuits]I was writing to you about this and could not in the meantime omit to carry out what M. Talon had established in Canada by order of His Majesty."[4] No matter what the Jesuits might say concerning the drunkenness of the Indians, he, Frontenac, could not see why, "provided the Indians were not given brandy in order to make them drunk and by this means to get their peltries cheaper," it was more sinful to give brandy for their wares than for the Bordeaux merchants to sell their wine to the Dutch and English, who, in their own country, get just as drunk as the Indians in Canada.

---

[2] Talon to Colbert, October 31, 1671, AC, C 11A, 3:157v; RAPQ, 1931, 150; November 2, 1671, RAPQ, 1931, 153; Louis XIV to Talon, May 17, 1672, AC, B 4:58; RAPQ, 1931, 167.

[3] Frontenac must be referring here to his ordinance of September 27, 1672, Archives of the Province of Quebec, cf. that of November 5, 1674, AC, F 3, 4:329. The ordinance in 1672, however, was not directed specifically against the brandy traffic, but against the coureurs de bois, and against those who went to the woods to trade with the Indians without a permit.

[4] Talon had received no order from His Majesty to grant complete freedom to the brandy traders.

That was precisely the difficulty; the Jesuits could not persuade Frontenac, because the governor did not want to be persuaded, and had withal a very good reason for refusing to be persuaded. Frontenac made here a noteworthy avowal by giving some of the reasons why the Jesuits opposed the unrestricted brandy trade. Besides the disorders, the missionaries wanted to protect the Indians against the unscrupulousness of traders who made the natives drunk in order to cheat them. Frontenac added: "With regard to the excesses and disorders, the Jesuits cannot impose upon me, after what I learned in the voyage I made this spring [1673] to Lake Ontario, where were assembled all the Iroquois nations—whom perhaps no missionary had ever seen—and where I did not notice anything extraordinary or scandalous, although a few young Indians for four days drank much brandy obtained from the English and brought thither, because none of the French with me had dared to give them any in view of my commands to the contrary."[5]

This is an example among many of the kind of arguments used by Frontenac. The boast of having seen Indians on whom missionaries never set their eyes, may be passed over. Frontenac conveniently forgot how those missionaries had been instrumental in determining the Iroquois braves—whom perhaps they had never seen—to meet the governor at Cataracouy.[6] The excesses complained of by the Jesuits were denied existence, because he noticed nothing extraordinary at Cataracouy after a few Indians had drunk much English brandy. Against these non-existent disorders and excesses, Frontenac himself had to issue an ordinance three months later.[7]

Colbert made answer the following year to Frontenac's petition to have the brandy question settled in Paris: "As for the brandy trade, it is a police matter, which pertains to the judges and to the Sovereign Council, but it is difficult to enter into the consciences of people."[8] It was much more than a matter for the police; a moral issue was involved. It belonged to the province of the civil tribunals to prevent the upset of good order by brawling drunkards; and to preserve red and white men alike from drunken Indians running amock in the villages.[9] But it was also a moral question. It concerned directly the consciences of people and priests alike and thereby came within the province of the Church, because first, the brandy trade, as understood by the merchants, the coureurs de bois, and the governor himself, was the cause of intolerable moral disorders, and secondly, because it threatened to ruin irretrievably the infant Church in New France. Frontenac and his followers, mainly those who profited by the trade, had every motive either to deny the existence of the disorders, or to minimize the havoc wrought by brandy among the Indians.[10] They knew, indeed, that if they admitted its existence, the king would not countenance the continuation of a trade so prejudicial to the true interests of the Indians. Louis XIV would have spurned revenues acquired at such a price. Frontenac, on the other hand, would have agreed with Vespasian that money does not smell.

---

[5] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 32.

[6] Cf. *Relations inédites,* I, 345-348; Margry, I, 239 ff.; NYCD, IX, 96, etc.

[7] Faillon, III, 491.

Laval's use of spiritual weapons to stem the evil was commended by the doctors of the Sorbonne,[11] and was approved by every upright man in Canada, but not by the relatively small, but highly vocal faction of merchants and peddlers whose coffers were being filled by the trade, and—

> What above all causes great injury to Religion at this time, was

---

[8] Colbert to Frontenac, May 17, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 57; cf. Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, *ibid.*, 82.

[9] Cf. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie*, 431-432.

[10] The registers of the Sovereign Council testify to the existence of these disorders caused by brandy, cf. *Jugements et délibérations*, I, 171, 368, "dans les derniers desordres que l'yvresse puisse produire," *ibid.*, 475. It was to prevent those disorders that the Council allowed every Frenchman in New France to sell brandy, *ibid.*, 535. It was because of the disorders that the ordinance of 1668 was modified in 1669, *ibid.*, 558, etc., and the brandy sellers whose "petit commerce" caused the disorders, were for the most part officers and soldiers, cf. Faillon, III, 390-393.

[11] *Mandements*, I, 94. Gosselin printed the answer of the Sorbonne theologians in his *Vie de Mgr de Laval*, II, Appendix, 679-683.

the opposition of the Recollects to the principles of Mgr de Laval and of the Jesuits with regard to the sale of brandy to the Indians. The ideas of Frontenac and of the politicians of the day would at last triumph! Priests had been found who were of the same opinion as they, who extolled those ideas, and came out as the defenders of those ideas. What had been maintained until now against the bishop and the Jesuits was not so evil after all; and the Jesuits, in showing themselves so uncompromising with regard to the brandy trade, had only in mind the tyrannization of the consciences of the people.

To give an idea of the attitude of the Recollects toward Laval and the Jesuits, the historian of the first Bishop of Quebec continues, quoting from a letter sent by the vicar-general to the bishop:

> One of the principal and best intentioned among the Recollects said yesterday, that the trouble came because there was no agreement on the fundamental principle of the whole question, namely, the bishop and the Jesuits forbid others to sell brandy so as to have the trade of liquor all to themselves. These good Fathers are so convinced of this that no matter what one may say to them, they will not change their mind. And this is not only said among themselves, but convinced of this, they hawk it about to people outside their community, to the Court, while M. de Frontenac, and those who think as he does, publish it all over France and Canada. You can judge what effect all this produces.[12]

---

[12] Gosselin, II, 90-91, the quotation is from a letter of Dudouyt to Laval, dated June 15, 16, 20, 1681, ASQ, *Lettres* Carton N, no. 59. The passage in question is dated June 20. Cf. Sixte Le Tac, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle-France, Appendix,* 189: "L'utilité du commerce des ecclésiastiques, l'establissement de leur credit en excusant leurs creatures & excommuniant les autres & leur attache à toutes leurs pensées sont les veritables motifs de cette deffence . . . La Sorbonne auroit repondu comme l'Université de Tholoze si le fait eust esté exposé sans passion. . . ." Those who petitioned the Toulouse theologians had asked whether the bishop could make the sale of brandy to the Iroquois and the Mohicans a reserved case, even in case the vendor was morally certain that, bringing the brandy to their villages, these Indians would get drunk there, but not in French territory. The brandy trade which Laval and the Jesuits opposed was emphatically not that mentioned by the petitioners to the theologians of the University of Toulouse. The good faith and sincerity of these gentlemen is well illustrated by this example, and one can judge how much store can be set on the sentence "si le fait eust esté exposé sans passion." Experience has shown that one cannot be too much on guard against those who feel the need to reassert in and out of season their standing foursquare with the truth:

Moreover it has been observed that:

> In estimating the importance to be attached to this Recollect conviction one must remember that in 1681, these monks were the allies and the protégés of Frontenac and the friends of La Salle, with very slight personal knowledge of the Indian missions. Considering how closely the bishop contained them to

---

"Et Comme ceux qui proposent ce cas de conscience scavent bien qu'ils se tromperoient eux mesmes s'ils imposoient à ceux qu'ils consultent, ils supplient les personnes qui auront la charité d'y répondre de mettre leur ame en repos en s'asseurant aussi de la verité de l'hypothese." It may be noted in passing that this petition was certainly not presented to the University of Toulouse by the Jesuits. In it we find stated that the Iroquois are not in French territory. Two years later, Frontenac was to accuse the Jesuits of acknowledging the sovereignty of England over the Iroquois country, *infra.* Eastman, 283, discussing the *Histoire de l'eau-de-vie en Canada* by M. de Belmont, quotes the Sulpician, saying: "The University of Toulouse was consulted, but its decision favored the traffic"; and Eastman adds in note: "Perhaps that is why we found no contemporary record of it." The petition to and the decision of the University of Toulouse taken from a contemporary record has been in print since 1888, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France, Appendix,* 187-188. The reason why it was not publicized is rather because the petitioners had distorted the facts, not because it favored the traffic. To explain certain gaps in the evidence it seems that the "disappearance" of documents is resorted to a little too often. The Jesuits and their supporters are usually given as those who spirited away documents which would damage their cause. It is forgotten, it seems, that those who first had access to the documents took good care that as many as possible which showed their heroes in a rather poor light should "disappear." Cf. de Villiers, *L'Expédition de Cavelier de la Salle dans le Golfe du Mexique, 1684-1687,* Paris, 1931, 60; Delanglez, *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* Chicago, 1938, 11-18. For years it has been said that the *First Establishment of the Faith* was suppressed because its author attacked the Jesuits. This legend arose either from a misreading of the text of the *Morale pratique,* or because the writers made use of a late edition of the works of Arnauld. The *Morale pratique,* VII, 319, (1716 edition), has: "Pendant quelque temps le Libraire a appréhendé pour son Livre [the *First Establishment*], mais lorsqu'on a fait voir qu'il n'y avoit rien a redire, Le Livre a passé, et il s'est toujours depuis vendu librement." They read: "The bookseller *a apprêhendé,* feared for his book," as if the text had: "The bookseller *fut appréhendé,* was arrested on account of his book," which is what is found in the 1780 Paris edition of the works of Arnauld. The present writer was unable to consult this edition, the quotation from it is taken from Harrisse, *Notes . . . ,* 159, n. 1. "Pendant quelque temps le Libraire *fut appréhendé* pour son Livre, mais lors qu'on a fait voir qu'il n'y avait rien a redire le Livre a passé, et il s'est toujours vendu depuis librement." There were three different editions of the *First Establishment* in two years. It goes to show the accuracy of the still current fable, according to which Hennepin secured the single copy which escaped destruction and used it to write his *New Discovery.* The present writer saw a dozen copies of that first, annihilated edition in the libraries of this country alone.

> their monastery, it is fair to surmise that the aforementioned accusation was based on hearsay from the party interested in the sale of brandy. Moreover . . . the Recollects themselves abandoned their early attitude on this subject. And the Sulpicians, who were equally prone to criticize the Jesuits, found no fault with their conduct in the fire-water controversy.[13]

As was seen this stupid calumny had already been aired by Mézy. Ten years before the Recollects were "convinced" of the reasons why the bishop and the Jesuits were opposed to the brandy traffic, Dumesnil had written in the same vein:

> The liquor trade with the Indians was by common consent abandoned to the bishop who, knowing that his censure [excommunication] was abusive and null, went to the Council, and with the help of his vicar-general and of Father Ragueneau, Jesuit, opened an office, installed an employee, and paid him a salary of 500 livres. This employee is giving brandy to the Indians for their peltries, and thus the bishop hopes to get all the profits of the fur trade for himself.[14]

To such arguments did the opponents of the clerics descend—the bishop operating a liquor store!

Colbert was in a quandary. On the one hand, the merchants of Quebec, and those who profited by the trade were sending memoirs minimizing the effects brandy had on the Indians; on the other hand, conditions were very bad, else Laval would not have taken such a grave step. Frontenac's correspondence to Paris during the years 1675-1678 is not extant, and so the development of the controversy must of necessity be followed in the answers of the king and of the minister. In Louis XIV's letter of April 28, 1677, in answer to Frontenac's of October 30, 1676, no mention of brandy occurs.[15] From this reply apparently Frontenac had begun to speak about the trade which "the ecclesiastics" were carrying on. It was a new method of attack and it will be dealt with below. Three weeks after Louis XIV had written, the minister replied to Frontenac, telling the governor that the king had ordered "to make known to you his intention on three or four points not treated in His Majesty's despatches."

---

[13] Eastman, 287.

[14] Memoir of Dumesnil, BRH, XXI, 1915, 199.

[15] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 28, 1677, RAPQ, 1927, 89-91.

> With regard to the liquor question, the Bishop of Quebec has had handed to me by his vicar-general a consultation of the Sorbonne, which contains facts which, if they be true, leave no possibility of hesitation about employing all means to prevent brandy being given to the Indians. But to tell you the truth, after having consulted M. Talon, the Sieur Bouteroue, and in general all those who have been in Canada, I found all these facts to be extremely exaggerated, and the authors of the memorandum to have generalized from a few particular cases. I am sending this consultation to the Sieur Duchesneau as well as a few other consultations made by my orders, and I am writing to him to show you all. His Majesty wishes you to examine together all the facts contained in the Sorbonne consultation and send him the truth in a joint letter. The intention of His Majesty is that if all the facts contained in this consultation are true, that is, if all the Indians in all the villages get drunk, and perpetrate the crimes, the murders, and other great excesses recounted therein, you must find means to prevent the sending of hard liquor to the Indians. But if these disorders are only caused by a few, and if they, the Indians, are only a little more inclined to drunkenness than the Germans are, or the Bretons in France, then His Majesty wishes you and Duchesneau to make use of his authority, not indeed to say directly anything against the episcopal authority, but only by means of the king's authority to prevent the bishop from undertaking anything outside the church on a matter which exclusively belongs to the police and is subjected to the laws and regulations which are, and can be made by the judges, with appropriate sanctions.[16]

Frontenac, and Talon before him,[17] persisted in asserting that brandy did not cause the awful disorders which had determined the bishop to make the selling or giving brandy to the natives a reserved case. These assertions, however, did not necessarily imply that these officials spoke against their better knowledge. They did not know better. They had not lived in the Indian villages. Frontenac had seen Indians in great number at Cataracouy and in Montreal for a few days or at the most for a few weeks, but was ignorant of what took place in the villages after the merchants had brought the fire-water to the natives.[18] Naturally, the traders did not report the frenzied orgies, as this would have been against their interests; and moreover, after they had made a whole village drunk and had seized the pelts of the Indians, they hied themselves to healthier surroundings.

---

[16] Colbert to Frontenac, May 18, 1677, RAPQ, 1927, 92.

[17] Yet Talon had realized the evils strong drinks wrought in the colony. That was his reason for building a brewery, in order to replace brandy and wine with beer. He had the Council issue an ordinance to restrict the import of wines and brandy as soon as the brewery be completed, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 477. Talon signed the ordinance of February 29, 1668, which says that "depuis quelques mois en ça on a veu les sauvages perpetüellement yvres et dans les derniers desordres que l'yvresse puisse produire," *ibid.,* I, 475.

In 1677, Colbert also wrote to Duchesneau. Frontenac had said the brandy trade "was necessary to the development of commerce. Yet, I see that your opinion is contrary to his; that is, you say the brandy trade with the Indians must be suppressed altogether." Colbert, his letter to the intendant stated, had consulted Talon and Bouteroue. Talon had written a memoir, which the minister was sending, together with other memoirs composed by "clever people" in Paris.

> Before siding with the bishop, you must carefully inquire how many murders, assassinations, how many arson cases, and other excesses have been caused by brandy since your arrival in Canada; you must send the proofs to me, because if these things really took place, you must not doubt that the king in his piety will give all the necessary orders to conform with the wishes of the Bishop of Quebec, and His Majesty will issue a very severe order to all his subjects never to engage again in such trade.

But no proof to such excesses is forthcoming, Colbert continued; far from it, the reports of those who have been in Canada state the opposite. Hence it is not right to forbid a profitable trade, just because the bishop wishes to prevent the abuse by a few of a thing good in itself. Moreover, the Indians will go to trade with the heretics, with the Dutch and English, if the French refuse to give them brandy. Liquor attracts them, makes them come near the

---

[18] "A peine y a il une bande de sauvages dans les bois qui n'aye des françois avec soy et Dieu scait ce qui s'y passe," Ordinance of February 29, 1668, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 475.

French, and thus they can be civilized, converted to the only true religion.[19]

Colbert did not scruple to repeat hypocritical arguments. Every one had said brandy was the major obstacle to the conversion of the Indians. This was one reason why the bishop, the Jesuits, and the Sulpicians opposed it. In a few months brandy set at nought the life time work of the missionaries. "If brandy were forbidden among the Indians," wrote Dollier de Casson, "we would have thousands of conversions to report. I have no doubt that all those who frequent the French settlements would become Catholics, but this liquor has such a diabolical fascination for them that all the Indians living near the French succumb to it, with the exception of a few Hurons whom God has miraculously preserved."[20]

The attitude of officialdom in Paris with regard to the fire-water controversy is reflected in M. Tronson's letters to his subordinates in Canada. We find in these letters an echo of what Colbert wrote to the governor and intendant of New France, which is natural enough, for the Sulpician was very close to the minister. Tronson believed what the Sulpicians of Montreal wrote about the disorders occasioned by the liquor traffic, but he knew the attitude of the minister revolved mainly around trade. He also knew Colbert considered the reports of the excesses committed by the drunken Indians extremely exaggerated. Just as Frontenac a few years before, Colbert "could not be persuaded" of the magnitude of the disorders. A month before the minister wrote to Duchesneau as quoted above, Tronson wrote:

> One more effort is to be made this year [1677] to have some regulation with regard to the liquor traffic. But I don't believe such regulation will be issued, unless Our Lord intervenes, for they cannot persuade themselves here that brandy is the cause of such disorders, and nothing said about the excesses carries conviction, since no formal proofs are forthcoming. It is an affair which requires much prayer, to which I see no other remedy.[21]

This request for formal proofs, for a judicial investigation is found in the letter of the minister to the intendant. The tone of the request implies ignorance of the conditions of New France. The greatest disorders, the foulest crimes took place in the Indian villages, where there was no judge, where there were no soldiers, no Frenchmen, except the missionaries. Their testimonies were not accepted because they were exaggerated. Against them was pitted Talon, who just passed through Canada, and "the clever people" in Paris who never went to New France. As noted before, there was no likelihood of brandy peddlers reporting the disorders. One need not feel overcome by the very official request that a judicial inquiry be made. It betokened no remarkable sincerity with regard to arriving at the truth, but rather was indicative of ignorance about the conditions in Canada, or of bluster. Can any one imagine the cumbersome French judicial machinery or some seventeenth-century Brid'oison transporting himself to the Iroquois or Ottawa villages and quizzing the Indians on their last orgy? Nothing else than "formal" inquests would have satisfied Colbert.

---

[19] Colbert to Duchesneau, May 1, 1677, Clément, III^2, 619-620.
[20] *Histoire du Montréal,* 114.
[21] Tronson to Lefebvre, April 5, 1677, no. 6.

Judging by his letter to Duchesneau, Colbert was losing patience. He had written to Frontenac that Laval's vicar-general in Paris had given him the memorandum of the doctors of the Sorbonne. M. Dudouyt in a long letter to Laval narrated his interviews with Colbert.[22] The priest had, he reported, presented himself in the public audience, begging the minister to have regard for the representations touching the moderation to be observed in the liquor traffic with the Indians; all their Christianity and even the welfare of the colony depended on such moderation.

> He [Colbert] replied in a very loud and severe tone—which is not usual in public audiences—that we were people who wished to mix in affairs which did not concern us, that we wished to encroach on the powers of the [civil] authorities, that we should attend only to preaching, confessing and exhorting. I told him

---

[22] Dudouyt to Laval, late in May 1677, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, 48², printed and translated in *Report of the Canadian Archives for 1885,* xcviii ff. After his audience with Colbert, May 12, 1677, Dudouyt wrote a brief outline of the interview with the minister, and promised to write more at length at a later date, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton S, no. 93.

> we interfered only with what concerned our ministry, and I represented matters to him so that he might regulate them as he should judge necessary, and, at the same time, I presented the resolution of the Sorbonne, which I had in my hand, saying: Here is the resolution of the six professors of the Sorbonne, in which you will see the truth clearly shown, and what can be done in the matter. To which he replied that he had been in possession of this information for ten years; the Bishop of Canada should attend to preaching, exhorting, etc., plainly showing me he was not pleased to listen to me on this subject, &c.

M. Dudouyt then presented another petition concerning the subsistence of the priests in Canada:

> To this he made no precise answer, but again said I might tell you that you should not meddle with other things besides preaching, exhorting, etc., and thereupon dismissed me. I had spoken and listened to him very quietly, although he had treated me in a very austere manner, and appeared to me completely prejudiced against you and all your clergy.

In this pass at arms Colbert does not get the palm. The fundamental rule of fair debate is to face the question, not to ignore it, evade it, or imitate the lion of the fable. Surprisingly, Colbert did not produce the decision of the University of Toulouse. It is hardly conceivable that the brandy trade apologists who presented it to the theologians of the southern university did not send it to Paris. If Colbert had it, and he most likely had it, it may be safely assumed that he saw that the brandy trade mentioned in the petition was not the one opposed by Laval and the Jesuits. If the petitioners did not send it to Paris, why did they not make use of the decision based on what they asserted were true premises?

> Some days after, M. de Bellinzany told me, that M. Colbert was much perplexed by the question of the liquor traffic, that he wished to do nothing against Religion and nothing which might be prejudicial to Christianity; that he had sent for two lawyers whom he had informed of the whole settlement of Canada from its beginning and had caused to be read the resolution of the Sorbonne in full, saying that he asked their advice with regard to the liquor traffic with the Indians as a police matter and not

as a religious matter; as to the latter, he would seek other advice; that the lawyers asked time till the following day.

Colbert wanted to hunt with the hounds and run with the hare. He could see how brandy was prejudicial to religion, but he did not want commerce to suffer. He was trying to reconcile his Catholicism with his mercantilism. He endeavored to separate two questions which, in this case, were of their nature inseparable. When he said the question was entirely political, he merely ignored the other phase altogether, and by denying its existence convinced himself that it did not exist. Whatever Lorin may assert,[23] it does not appear a master stroke of political genius to deny the existence of a problem; neither law, nor edict, nor ordinance causes a fact to vanish, even should the document emanate from a great minister. The lawyers consulted promptly returned a decision which allowed brandy to the Indians. Then Colbert informed them he would seek advice elsewhere with regard to the religious or moral phase of the question, as though he had not already all the advice he needed. Where would this advice come from? He had the decision of the theologians of the Sorbonne based on facts supplied by those acquainted with the conditions in the Indian villages. The French bishops were clearly not competent, for the conditions in Canada were totally different from those in the mother country. It was precisely this difference upon which the missionaries actually living with the Indians insisted so much; namely, the inability of the Indians to resist getting drunk when enough brandy was supplied to them, and their utter lack of inhibitions when they were intoxicated. Police regulation which checked the disorders of drunken Frenchmen had no effect on Indians. They were not deemed responsible for their actions once under the influence of liquor, and at other times they were looked upon as minors. The first consultation presented to the Sorbonne, a decade before Frontenac arrived in Canada, asked whether the bishop of Quebec was justified in excommunicating the French who sold brandy to the Indians. For the guidance of the theologians a remark was added: "The governors of the country cannot govern the Indians as they can the Europeans; the Indians throughout nearly the whole of America are looked upon as wards and minors against whom no suit can be brought. This is the reason why Frenchmen and other Europeans are forbidden to sell them liquor."[24] In the consultation of 1675, the petitioner pointed out that the severity of the laws enacted in New England was directed against the whites who sold brandy to the natives.[25]

---

[23] *Le Comte de Frontenac,* 176.

M. Dudouyt had to wait two weeks before being granted a private audience with the minister. It took place May 11, 1677, at Sceaux:

> I was with him alone for nearly three quarters of an hour, during which he spoke and listened to me patiently and even kindly, except on some part pertaining to the reserved case. I was beginning to say something, when he interrupted, and said: He knew our zeal; he wished to destroy vice to the very root; we did what missionaries ought to do, and there are many things it is necessary to tolerate as was done elsewhere; we wished to carry things to too great a perfection.

Colbert seems to have thought the missionaries' consciences were clear after they had made their verbal protests; their duty done, they should let the matter rest. With regard to the toleration spoken of by the minister, it was less bluntly, but no less clearly expressed in the statement made by Lionne ten years before in the instructions to Tracy: "The said Bishop of Petraea and the Jesuit Fathers persist in their first opinions—the reserved case—without reflecting that prudence, and even Christian charity, inculcate closing the eyes to one evil to avoid a greater, or to reap a good more important than the evil."[26] From this the more important good is clearly the increase of trade, and as was later pharisaically asserted, the conversion of the Indians, who would come to the French and embrace Catholicism, if given their fill of brandy.

Dudouyt answered Colbert: "If the disposition of the Indians with regard to liquor were like that of the people of Europe, it would be unnecessary to think of following any other course than the one followed everywhere else, but the whole difficulty of this matter consists in properly understanding the difference between the Indians of North American and the people of Europe with regard to liquor." The vicar-general then gave an example. If, he said, there is brandy for two days, drunkenness will last two days, if there is enough for a week, it will last a week, and not only will the men be drunk but the whole village, old and young, men, women, and children. The facts with regard to the disorders were not misrepresented to the Sorbonne theologians.[27] Only interested persons, "who wish to have beavers from the Indians by means of liquor, without respect to the risk of the disorders they cause by that means, and without regard to their own salvation or that of the Indians,"[28] assert the contrary, or only those who think that all moral considerations should give way to the development of commerce, such as Talon, who by his memoir, "had rendered bad service to the Church of Canada."[29] Colbert, said Dudouyt, could have inquiries made on the spot by disinterested persons. Orders had been sent to this effect, replied the minister. Dudouyt did not ask for the absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic, but only for measures regulating it. He would permit its sale in the French settlements only, "where everything would be done in the sight and to the knowledge of the public," to allow a moderate sale of liquor, namely, not enough to make the Indians drunk. The Indians themselves had presented such a petition to the governor.[30]

---

[24] *Mandements,* I, 41.

[25] *Ibid.,* 93.

[26] NYCD, IX, 22; cf. the petition presented to the University of Toulouse, *Histoire chronologique,* 187, 188.

Dudouyt is here undoubtedly alluding to the request made in 1676 when some Hurons moved from the Prairie de la Madeleine to Montreal. The chief of these Hurons, knowing the weakness of his fellow Indians, in a moving plea asked Frontenac to protect his people against the solicitations of the brandy peddlers. "Prevent them, after having solicited us to drink and after having made us drunk, from writing our names in their books, and forbid them, when we come back from our hunt in the spring, to rob us . . ." Frontenac made a truly astonishing answer to this plea, considering his knowledge of the propensity of the Indians by this time, and considering his power, if he were willing, to regulate the traffic. He replied to this Indian chief that he would make him and his people happy in Montreal, "but with regard to brandy, Onontio was not the master of it. It is for thee to protect thyself against the solicitations of the French who want to make thee drunk; if they rob thee or do thee an injustice, thou hast only to complain to me, and Onontio will see that justice be done thee . . ."[31] Such petitions would be pigeon-holed by Frontenac. It would never do to send them to Paris. They would refute an argument of great weight in government circles and one which the traffickers were constantly bringing forward.

---

[27] Cf. *Mandements,* I, 91-93.

[28] Cf. Le Clercq, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* 425-427.

[29] La Chesnaye, in 1693, claimed that it was in order to "chagriner" the bishop that Talon had the Council pass the ordinance of 1668, AC, C 11A, 12:380.

[30] Cf. *Mandements,* I, 93; *Relations inédites,* I, 37.

In 1678, Dollier's health had sufficiently improved to enable him to return to Canada when M. Tronson wrote to him:

> I saw M. Colbert who twice spoke to me about you and asked me whether you were [still] in this city [Paris]. I undertook to write to you to know the truth about what is happening in Canada. Thus it is important for you to let us know whether there is fear lest the Indians go to the English, if the French do not give them brandy; whether you believe it would ruin the commerce of Canada; what disorders you have heard about . . .[32]

The following week Tronson wrote to M. Ranuyer:

> It is important for us to be enlightened on several things about which I beg you to write to me, not indeed what others may say about them, but what you yourself believe. Do you think most of the Indians who take brandy away with them [to their villages] get drunk? Do you think if they are refused to take brandy to their villages, they will go to New Netherland to get it? Do you think the refusal would injure the commerce or be detrimental to the trade of Canada? Or might it lead to war,

---

[31] Discours des sauvages Hurons qui demandent des Terres aux Seigneurs Du Mont real dedans leur Ille, ASQ, *Polygraphie,* IV, n. 20.

[32] Tronson to Dollier, May 16, 1678, no. 59.

or have other deplorable consequences? Do not scruple to give me fully your opinion on all this.[33]

This argument, the likelihood of Indians going to the Dutch and the English if refused brandy, had been used by Colbert in his letter to Duchesneau. The minister again used it in his interview with Dudouyt. "The French," replied the vicar-general, "would not make five hundred less skins a year by preserving the moderation necessary for Christianity and the good of the colony, a very little thing to cause so much disorder." It is a matter of historical knowledge, that it was not the restricted brandy trade which drove the Indians to the English or to the Dutch, but the rapacity of the brandy peddlers, or the coureurs de bois, and their protectors, the merchants and the officials who profited by the trade.

Colbert objected to the reserved case. Such a procedure, he said, was not followed in France to prevent drunkenness. Dudouyt answered the objection by saying there was a difference between the Indians and the Bretons, and ended his report of the interview with these words: "He told me he saw plainly that he could not convince me on that subject, for he had prepared himself and was resolved to convince me if he could, as he said and as I knew."

Dudouyt thought it better to change the subject of the conversation. He advised the bishop to send a remonstrance to the king, designed to show plainly and without exaggeration the condition of affairs by going into details, for generalities prove nothing. He then suggested a few items so the remonstrance would reveal how churches in Acadia had to be abandoned on account of excesses in liquor and similar causes; the testimony of persons worthy of credit should be taken in proof of the facts; the possibility of carrying on the liquor trade with moderation, as in Tadoussac and elsewhere, was to be shown; the most important decrees and ordinances should be cited, and the petitions of the Indians for restriction in the brandy trade sent; in a word, nothing should be omitted by which the truth can be made known,[34] for "I do not doubt that M. de Frontenac and those interested in the trade will do all that is possible to have the contrary said and believed." M. Dudouyt clearly saw that the liquor traffic question would not be settled this year, 1677. It would take some time for the inquiries which Colbert had ordered Duchesneau to make, to get to France. As was seen, those who opposed the brandy trade were just as eager to make the truth appear as Colbert was to know it. Such reports, besides vindicating the truth of the contents of the consultation presented to the Sorbonne theologians, would prove moderation in brandy trade to be necessary and possible. Colbert had answered nothing to Dudouyt, when the vicar-general made clear that the missionaries did not ask for complete prohibition, but only for a moderate sale of liquor.

---

[33] Tronson to Ranuyer, May 22, 1678, no. 61.

[34] That they began to gather such information is clear from the sheaf of documents in ASQ, *Polygraphie,* IV, no. 19 to 30, these are

The opprobrious label of "prohibitionist" applied to the bishop, his clergy, and the Jesuits by some writers who have treated the question, is an inaccurate catchword, and, if used seriously, it reveals a very superficial reading of the evidence. A Protestant historian was the first to point out the difference: "When we read of the tireless zeal of the clergy in their battle against the liquor trade with the Indians, we must be on our guard against confounding them with the temperance workers of our day. To the moderate usage of brandy by Frenchmen, bishop and Jesuits made no objection . . . Since, then, the priests had no aversion to liquor in itself, for themselves or other white men, we must consider all the more seriously their hostility to its use by Indians."[35] Even this statement should be qualified. Neither the Jesuits, nor the bishop were averse to the moderate use of liquor by Indians. Just as Dudouyt inveighed against the unrestricted brandy trade, so did Le Clercq,[36] so did the Jesuits, and the Sulpicians.

In his letter to Duchesneau the following year, 1678, Colbert clearly showed he was not in favor of moderation.

---

copies of ordinances of the Sovereign Council against the brandy trade, extracts from laws passed in New England, the petition of the Huron Indians to Frontenac, etc., all of which became useless after the promulgation of the royal ordinance of 1679.

[35] Eastman, 76.

[36] *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* 426.

He wished brandy to be sold, as much brandy as possible, for this would mean an increase in commerce, evidently his main concern.

Duchesneau examined the memoirs of the "clever people" and the memoir of Talon, sent to him in Canada by Colbert in 1677. The minister received Duchesneau's reply and manifested his displeasure by reproaching the intendant for his subserviency to Laval.

> When you say giving the Indians a sufficient quantity of brandy to make them drunk must be forbidden, you should also say how this word *sufficient* is to be interpreted, how much that will be and who will judge. To tell the truth, such a thought should never enter the mind of an intendant. Your duty was to investigate the facts advanced by the bishop justifying his making the sale of brandy a reserved case, that is to say, to have the matter examined by the judges, as to whether the crimes alleged by the bishop are true or not, and if they are, your duty was to punish the transgressors. Thus, either the punishment would put an end to those crimes, or if they should continue to be perpetrated, the king would follow the sentiments of the bishop. But that an intendant without examining the facts, should adopt an opinion held nowhere else in the Christian world, can only come from too much subserviency to the bishop or too much opposition to the governor.[37]

A memoir containing the arguments for the continuation or abolition of the brandy trade was sent to Quebec.[38] The principal inhabitants were to meet to pass upon the question. The memoir summarizes the arguments of both sides. They have already been recited in the previous pages. There is nothing either new or original in the memoir. Those who opposed the unrestricted trade based their stand on the propensity of the Indians to get intoxicated and on the consequent inevitable disorders. The remedy suggested was permission to sell only a moderate and harmless amount of liquor to the natives, and not absolute prohibition. Nothing was said about the sale to the French, who were unrestricted in their potions. The bishop and the Jesuits fought for the protection of the Indians in the name of humanity and religion.

---

[37] Colbert to Duchesneau, May 15, 1678, Clément, III², 633. Charlevoix, III, 195, has a résumé of this letter.

[38] Cf. Colbert to Frontenac, May 24, 1678, RAPQ, 1927, 96.

The partisans of the unrestricted brandy trade brought up several points: nowhere else was the sale of brandy ever made a reserved case; the alleged crimes should be punished by the courts; those who sell brandy should not be held to account. It would be dangerous to interdict the sale of liquor in Canada, they claimed, as though there was ever any question of taking such a measure. Since in the kingdom the sale of brandy was not a reserved case, the inhabitants of Canada may become inclined to look upon *all* the regulations of the Church as arbitrary, and dependent upon the whims and fancies of an individual bishop. It is almost a waste of time to refute such logic. Brandy peddling was no reserved sin in France for the simple reason that there were no Indians in the mother country. A few crimes may have been committeed by drunkards, it was grudgingly admitted, but not enough to justify making the sale of brandy a reserved case. Brandy, it was finally maintained, is a means to attract the Indians to Catholicism. If the French refuse to sell it, the natives will go to the Dutch and to the English, and Canada will lose a profitable trade to the advantage of heretics who will convert the Indians to their false religion.[39] "This argument, no doubt, was dashed largely with hypocrisy in those who used it; but it was one which the priests were largely perplexed to answer."[40] Dudouyt seems to have found little difficulty in answering it, and it would have collapsed of itself if Frontenac had sent the petitions of the Indians begging him to forbid the sale of brandy.

The meeting of the inhabitants was held in Quebec, October 26, 1678. Twenty were summoned. The arguments of their speeches are not different from those already known.[41] "Unfortunately, most of those who had been selected were interested in the nefarious trade. Fifteen among them maintained that the brandy trade was absolutely necessary for the welfare of the colony . . . five acted as men of character and voted against its continuation."[42] These five were of the opinion that the brandy trade with the Indians ought to be prohibited or restricted. "The majority of these commercial men were inclined to minimize the importance of the crimes caused by *eau-de-vie*. It was their interest to do so, and, besides, living for the most part among Frenchmen, they were not as well situated as were the missionaries to observe the effect of a few barrels of brandy on an Indian village."[43]

---

[39] Mémoire sur la traite des boissons spiritueuses, May 24, 1678, Clément, III^2, 635-637. Cf. the elaborate answer to these arguments in *Mandements,* I, 149-156.

[40] Parkman, *Old Régime,* 324.

[41] AC, F 3, 5:75-83; Margry, I, 405-420; *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 247-253. There is an excellent résumé of the various speeches in Eastman, 191-195.

On November 7, two councillors, Dupont and Peyras, were dispatched to France with the ballot; the formal inquiries made by Duchesneau on the disorders attending the brandy trade were also sent to Paris.[44] Peyras was Frontenac's man,[45] and it needed little imagination to guess what policy he would advocate in Paris. The welfare of the natives would not weigh heavier with him than it did with his master. Hence it was that Laval determined to betake himself to France and plead in person the cause of the Indians.

A difficult task awaited the bishop. He probably reached France at the end of 1678 or at the beginning of 1679. In March of the latter year, Tronson wrote to Dollier: "Nothing is decided yet about the brandy question; my Lord of Quebec discussed it at length with M. Colbert";[46] and two days later: "The brandy question is still on the carpet. My Lord of Quebec would like very much to have a decision as soon as possible to return to Canada with the first ships to sail. But I don't know whether it will be settled as soon as that."[47] Again sometime in May,

> The brandy question encounters much opposition. Nevertheless it will be settled this year. It has been referred to my Lord the Archbishop of Paris and to Father de la Chaise. At the ministry they have no mind to give complete satisfaction to my Lord of

---

[42] BRH, XII, 1906, 375-376, cf. Ferland, *Cours d'histoire du Canada,* Quebec, 1866, II, 106-107.

[43] Eastman, 195.

[44] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 262.

[45] Cf. Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 80.

[46] Tronson to Dollier, March 14, 1679, no. 71.

[47] *Id.* to *id.,* March 16, 1679, no. 72.

> Quebec. I don't know yet what the final decision will be, but it will apparently not go as far as to prevent the Indians from bringing brandy to their villages. *My Lord of Quebec passes for being too hard and too obstinate, so that little credence is placed on what he says.*[48]

A few days before the decision was arrived at by the king, Tronson wrote as follows to another Sulpician of Montreal:

> The greatest difficulty will be with regard to liquor, for they will not issue as strict a regulation as my Lord of Quebec would wish to have, because people are not persuaded that the disorders are as universal as he says they are, and because they believe that this trade is necessary for the colony, hence they will not easily adopt his ideas. The question has already been submitted to the king who sent it to my Lord the Archbishop of Paris and to Father de la Chaise, and the decision may be expected any day now.[49]

After the French prelate and the Jesuit had conferred with the Bishop of Quebec, after cognizance had been taken of their deliberations, Louis XIV issued an ordinance to be engrossed in the registers of the Superior Council, and given to the colonial authorities for enforcement. This ordinance was dated May 24, 1679, and it regulated the brandy trade in New France without modifications for a quarter of a century. It forbade the carrying of liquor to the Indian villages distant from the French settlements.[50] The council in Quebec registered it on October 16 of the same year.[51] Colbert wrote to Frontenac that it was drafted on the conclusions reached by the Archbishop of Paris and Father de la Chaise, who "assured His Majesty the Bishop of Quebec would restrict the reserved case to the violators of its provisions.[52] Thus there is reason to hope this great difficulty which has lasted so long will at last be removed."[53]

---

[48] *Id.* to *id.*, May 1679, no. 74; the words in italics are in code. Cf. Tronson to La Colombière, April 19, 1685, no. 276; and the passage from Tremblay's letter in Faillon, III, 160.

[49] Tronson to Perrot, May 20, 1674, no. 81.

[50] *Edits,* I, 235.

[51] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 320.

[52] The vicar-general in Quebec restricted the reserved case in conformity with the tenor of the ordinance as soon as the document reached Quebec, Duchesneau to Colbert, November 10, 1680, AC, C 11A, 5:54.

The ordinance did not satisfy either party. "My Lord of Quebec brought himself [se résoud] to adopt the expedient proposed by my Lord the Archbishop of Paris and to suspend the reserved case for one year."[54] Laval certainly expected more stringent restrictions. If he was not fully satisfied with the ordinance, Frontenac was not satisfied at all. It put a check on the unrestricted freedom of the brandy trade advocated by the governor, and he considered it a defeat. His pride was hurt. His repeated and slanderous insinuations, his attack against Laval and the Jesuits had met with little success; Colbert made no reference to his letters which indicates that either he or the king actually believed the governor. Frontenac had recourse to a petty revenge. He now vented his wrath on Duchesneau.

The initial quarrel over the respective powers of the governor and the intendant had abated. The brandy ordinance of 1679 caused a renewal of the strife. From 1679 to 1682 the registers of the Sovereign Council contain little else than a recital of arbitrary acts, of violences, of complaints on the part of the governor against the intendant. In their letters each accuses the other of clandestine trade. Colbert wrote to both, urging union and peace, blaming both, threatening both. The king, too, was losing patience with the cantankerous governor, especially when he learned that the ordinance of 1679 was being violated.[55] Canoes leaving for the Indian settlements were carrying their load of brandy.[56] Furthermore, from the very beginning of his term, Frontenac had been ordered to rid the colony of the coureurs de bois.[57] After a flurry of zeal at the beginning,[58] he soon concluded he had better take no energetic measures against them, since their existence was too profitable.[59] He himself wrote to the king that they still numbered more than eight hundred,[60] while he had written to Colbert six years before that only five were left.[61] Frontenac alone was to blame for this state of affairs, wrote Louis XIV, for he had it in his power to put an end to this plague, the greatest obstacle to the colonization of New France as demanded by the king. This disobedience to the stringent royal orders about the coureurs de bois, together with the complaints of the contractors against the governor and his disunion with Duchesneau caused his recall, more than all the other complaints about his abuse of power, and very much more than the intrigues of "the Canada-mission party."[62] Any one can see this for himself by reading the king's letters of April 29, 1680,[63] and April 30, 1681.[64] The letter sent by Duchesneau, November 13, 1681,[65] the memoirs which the intendant's secretary carried to Paris,[66] brought things to a climax. Frontenac who had constantly ascribed disobedience to the Jesuits and others was himself the king's most disobedient servant. He could do just as he pleased, he boasted, even though his head were to fall. He did not lose his head but he lost his job.

---

[53] Colbert to Frontenac, May 24, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 101; cf. Colbert to Duchesneau, May 24, 1679, AC, B 8:18v-19, Clément, III², 641.

[54] Tronson to Dollier, June 1, 1679, no. 78.

[55] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 658.

[56] Cf. Frontenac's quibbling about the meaning of the ordinance of 1679, *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 664-665, and d'Auteuil's answer, *ibid.,* 668.

[57] Louis XIV to Frontenac, June 5, 1672; June 5, 1673; Colbert to *id.,* June 13, 1673, in RAPQ, 1927, 9, 23, 24, etc.

[58] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 14; *id.* to *id.,* November 13, 1673, *ibid.,* 43.

Yet powerful influences were at work in Paris to prevent what was considered, and was really, his disgrace. The "intrigues of the Canada-mission party" had very little if anything to do with the recall of Frontenac. There were two men in Paris in a position to know, M. Tronson and M. Dudouyt. The latter was the representative of Laval, the head of the so-called Canada-mission party. It would be ridiculous to expect the vicar-general to shed tears over the recall of the governor, but he had nothing to do with the demotion of Frontenac, except perhaps insofar as he encouraged those determined to bring about the fall of the governor. But M. Tronson above all was in a position to know what took place in the bureaus of the Colonial Office.

---

[59] There were very few condemnations from 1676 to 1681, cf. *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 260, 263-264, 343-344, 358-359, 578-579, and the letter of Frontenac to Colbert, February 16, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 53.

[60] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 30, 1681, Clément, III², 645; Duchesneau in his letter to Colbert, November 13, 1680, AC, C 11A, 5:178, also gives 800 men in the woods; in another memoir of the intendant, of the same date, their number is said to be between five and eight hundred, cf. the king's answer to Duchesneau, April 30, 1681, AC, B 8:81. Le Clercq, *First Establishment,* I, 41, wrote: "In the first two years . . . you [Frontenac] have entirely destroyed the bushlopers."

[61] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 57, 68.

[62] Lorin, 165. But for the strong assurances of Frontenac's friends in Paris that he would mend his ways, Louis XIV would have recalled him in 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 114. Cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 471, 473.

[63] RAPQ, 1927, 113-116.

[64] Clément, III², 644-649.

[65] AC, C 11A, 5:290-306, 307-323; NYCD, IX, 160, Margry, II, 266.

[66] Dudouyt to Laval, March 9, 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 61.

Extracts from the Sulpician's letters were given previously, indicating which enemies were working for the recall of the governor. But his greatest enemy was Frontenac's own pugnacious character, which rendered him unable to live in peace with those around him. In March 1682, Tronson notified Dollier: "There will be changes in Canada this year. They are convinced here that the welfare of the colony calls for such changes."[67] In his letter to the bishop of Quebec, the superior of the Sulpicians did not enter into details, since M. Dudouyt was to write them at length. There is not much news, he said, "about the principal affair, except that everybody very much bestirs himself, and all is being prepared for a great change. It is hoped we shall soon see the end. It is also hoped they will attend to this business in such a manner as to be over with it or well advanced by next week."[68] It took longer than Tronson thought, because of the bestirrings. Dudouyt, in effect, wrote to the bishop. He waited two weeks before sending the details of the double execution, because he had not been able to get them before.

> M. de Frontenac received great support from his friends. Mme de Frontenac, M. de Menar, M. de L'Estrade and many others have worked strenuously on his behalf. If he had not carried things to such extremes he would have remained governor.[69] But

---

[67] Tronson to Dollier, March 29, 1682, no. 154.

[68] Tronson to Laval, April 2, 1682, no. 155.

[69] "M. de Frontenac and M. Duchesneau are both recalled. Things were so disposed that their friends who spared nothing to help them were unable to be successful," Tronson to Dollier, May 15, 1682, no. 165. M. Tronson said practically the same thing in his letter

the complaints against him have been so strong, and so well proved that it was not possible to defend him. M. de Seignelay has wanted to make a thorough study of this affair, the king himself has desired to take cognizance of it,[70] and M. Riverin has done his duty well, so that the truth being made known, it was judged that peace could only be restored in the colony by recalling M. de Frontenac.[71] M. Duchesneau was also recalled, because after their quarrels, they did not want to recall the one without recalling the other, lest the governor's authority appear to be impaired, and the friends of M. de Frontenac would have been too much affected if M. Duchesneau had remained as intendant while M. de Frontenac was recalled. This does not prevent the revocation of M. de Frontenac from being the justification of M. Duchesneau's conduct. Since all he did and suffered in what has taken place comes from his fulfilling the duties of his charge, he is all the more praiseworthy before God and men. He was well spoken of at the Court. M. Colbert Croissy will give him some position, and M. Tronson will help him.[72]

With the exception of Riverin, the vicar-general does not supply the names of the other champions of the intendant, but he gives the names of several of the supporters of Frontenac, who tried to foil the "intrigues of the Canadian-mission party," which meant, for Lorin and consorts, the intrigues of Laval and the Jesuits, mainly the latter. Further in the same letter, after having notified the bishop of the changes and spoken about the officials who were going to Canada to take the places of Frontenac and Duchesneau, Dudouyt wrote: "In the changes [that have taken place], and in the present crisis, it has been a good thing that neither the Church nor you in particular had

---

to Duchesneau, May 3, 1682, no. 164, and to Frontenac, June 2, 1682, no. 169, when he sent his sympathies to the two officials.

[70] "M. Dudouyt . . . must have told you how thoroughly M. the Marquis de Seignelay took cognizance of this matter, with what zeal he reported to the king, and how he applied himself to procure peace to the colony," Tronson to Laval, June 9, 1682, no. 170.

[71] See the letter of Seignelay to Laval, May 26, 1682: "His Majesty having resolved to recall M. the comte de Frontenac and the Sieur Duchesneau on account of their continual divisions, he has chosen M. de la Barre . . . and the Sieur de Meules . . ." as their successors, AC, B 8:129.

[72] Dudouyt to Laval, May 26, 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 62.

any share in all the quarrels which have taken place since your return to Canada [in 1680]."[73]

It has been observed above how, after 1677, the Jesuits well-nigh disappear from the governor's correspondence; not once does he connect them with the "persecutions" he underwent from his "enemies." This is significant, for if they had given the least cause, or if they had shown the least sign of partiality for the faction opposed to Frontenac, he would likely have mentioned it. The proof of this lies in one of the governor's letters of 1674. He was then in the midst of his quarrel with Perrot and Fénelon and the Sulpicians of Montreal. After having presented an interminable account of this imbroglio to the minister, he added: "The Jesuits are the only ones who have not appeared in all this, although they may have as great a share as the others, but they are more clever and hide their hand better; their superieur [Dablon] is a very quiet and very prudent man, and not at all a mischiefmaker, with whom I have always got along well, and who, I think, is satisfied with me as I am forced [to say] I am satisfied with him."[74] The insinuation of the Jesuits having perhaps as great a share as the others is merely an indication of the governor's suspicious character. He had enough busybodies who watched the Jesuits, and who knew that any report of the activities of the Jesuits in behalf of Perrot and the Sulpicians would be sure to be rewarded; he had enough spies in Montreal and elsewhere to have known whether or not the Jesuits were working covertly for his adversaries.

As for Laval, the last mention of the bishop is in the governor's letters of November 1679, when the prelate was in France. Frontenac therein complained that the chapter of the Cathedral of Quebec was not functioning, although the bishop received a subsidy to pay its members.[75] Finally, never did Frontenac either at the time of his return in 1689, or during his second term, accuse the "Canada-mission party" of having brought about his downfall of 1682. And he would have known it, for his wife, his friends, and his supporters, such as Bernou and Renaudot, had free entry in the bureaus of the Colonial Office in Paris.

---

[73] *Id. to id.,* May 30, 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 62.

[74] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 73.

[75] Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 6, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 110.

New information derived from the letters of Dudouyt and Tronson absolves the Canada-mission party from the guilt of underhand maneuvering for the recall of Frontenac, and even makes the Canada-mission party, built up by Lorin for the exoneration of his hero, a myth. Until 1682, what Duchesneau lacked was a good press agent in Paris. While Frontenac's friends were besmirching the intendant, the latter had no one to take up his defense, wrote Dudouyt to Laval. In governmental circles, it was said "that nothing was so weak as Duchesneau's reports, that there was nothing worth while in them, etc., and it was said that a résumé which M. Boisseau [one of Frontenac's guards] had made of his own reports, and which he sent [to the minister] was so good that it could not be better."[76] Duchesneau learned his lesson. In 1681 he sent Riverin,[77] his secretary, with his memoirs to Paris.[78] From what Dudouyt says in the letter quoted above, and from what Tronson wrote to Duchesneau,[79] Riverin, although lacking the powerful influence and the connections of the governor's friends, succeeded, owing to his ability and above all, owing to the weight of proofs he had brought along, in outmaneuvering Frontenac's supporters; the only reason given for recalling Duchesneau was the unwillingness to sadden Mme de Frontenac and those who had tried with might and main to save her husband from the disgrace of a recall.

Thus ended the first term of Frontenac. As an administrator he was a signal failure.[80] "What progress," wrote

---

[76] Dudouyt to Laval, May 10, 1681, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 57.

[77] Cf. Memoir of Frontenac on the coureurs de bois, [1681?], RAPQ, 1927, 120; Lorin, 265.

[78] Dudouyt to Laval, March 9, 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 61.

[79] Tronson to Duchesneau, May 3, 1682, no. 164. In later years, d'Auteuil, who also was in Paris at this time, was to boast that he was responsible for Frontenac's recall.

[80] The reader wishing to convince himself of the benefits derived by Canada from the first administration of Frontenac, should read his correspondence for the ten years it lasted. Self-praise, recriminations, complaints, accusations, puerile claims for "dignities," or "honors," describe most of the contents of the governor's letters to France during that period. By way of contrast cf. the correspondence of Talon during his two short terms.

Rochemonteix, "did the colonization of Canada make during his government? His great admirer, M. Lorin, is asking the question, and sums up his answer in one line: 'We cannot say very precisely in what it consisted, but on the whole, there is an undeniable progress.' "[81] This is particularly damaging coming, as it does, from one who wishes to hold up Frontenac as a model colonial administrator. Lorin, in spite of all his good will, is unable to point out any single measure evincing marked administrative ability on the part of Frontenac. The four or five pages he devoted to summing up the achievements of Frontenac during his first term are full of sententious statements. One of these is the "Canadian society becoming self conscious."[82] One is entitled to wonder how this can be proved or disproved, and just what it had to do with Frontenac's administrative capacity.

The ordinance of May 1679 did not solve the brandy problem. Disorders, excesses continued and crimes were still perpetrated by the drunken Indians. The missionaries continued sending their protests, but all in vain. The question entered a new phase during the second governorship of Frontenac; a new champion of the sale of brandy to the Indians appeared on the scene with the emergence in the West of Antoine Laumet, *alias* de Lamothe Cadillac. This phase, however, belongs chronologically to a subsequent study.

---

[81] Rochemonteix, III, 153.
[82] Lorin, 247.

THE TRADE OF THE JESUITS

THE TRADE OF THE JESUITS

SECTION 1. BEFORE 1672

The brandy ordinance of 1679 incensed Frontenac. He was at this time in straits with the home government because of his past high-handed treatment of the Sovereign Council and councillors. His policy toward the bishop, the clergy, and the missionaries was receiving royal frowns. His frenchification ideas had come practically to nought. His individual letters to the court containing recriminations and justifications had not only been repudiated in part or in whole, but they were also portraying his character in no satisfactory colors, and the picture of himself which he was laboring to produce in the minds of official France was taking an unholy shape, one that would have amazed him had he been given the gift to see himself as others saw him. And now his views on the brandy question had met rebuff. This was bad, but equally bad was what the ordinance signified in its application, a serious curtailment of his trade profits. His scheme of accusing others of violations of ordinances when he himself was a violator readily came to mind. He had already used this method as a means of diverting the attention of the government from his own practices, and hence to a similar purpose he bethought himself of accusing the men of the cloth in Canada, Recollects excepted, of trading. How he fared in the progress of the dispute about the commercial undertakings of the priests of New France, and especially of the Jesuits, has now to be related.

It is necessary at the outset to define the term "trade," which will be bandied about. The French word designating all transactions in colonial days was *traitte* or *traite,* which, since it was a general term, meant trade or commerce, and also exchange, barter.[1] The meaning depended upon whether one was selling goods in a commercial way for profit or whether one was exchanging his own wares for other goods for use. It is undoubtedly true that the Jesuits—and in fact all missionaries who lived among the Indians—bartered. There was barter for profit and on a greater or smaller scale, and there was barter between individuals who had no motive for gain. In this last named manner, all missionaries living among the Indians were accustomed to trade. They exchanged French trinkets for beaver skins, the common currency in the colony, and in turn exchanged these beaver skins for the various commodities they needed and could not otherwise acquire. For a long time there was very little specie in New France. Direct exchange of one product for another, even among the French, was the rule.[2] It was cumbersome, unsatisfactory, especially for the transactions for new settlers who had known a more convenient medium of exchange in the old country. There was consequently great satisfaction after the coming of the Carignan regiment because the soldiers had brought specie to the colony.[3] Later, as a remedy for this situation, colonial card money was issued to facilitate exchanges among the French.

---

[1] Mary of the Incarnation, 122. Soldiers were without arms "pour avoir traité leurs fusils," Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 16. Hennepin uses the word "troquer" which was translated into English by "to truck," *New Discovery,* 310, 549, 553. We also find at the beginning of the eighteenth century "faire le troc," RAPQ, 1923, 71.

Between Europeans and Indians, however, bartering prevailed until the end of the French régime and long after in what had been New France.[4] The fundamental reason for this was that the Indians did not care for money;[5] they would not have known what to do with it, except perhaps use the coins as ornaments. They preferred useful or "fashionable" objects, such as "fire arms, powder, lead, thread for nets, axes, knives, needles, awls,"[6] bright color cloth, mirrors, and glass beads known as *porcelaine* or *rassade.*

---

[2] Cf. Talon to Colbert, November 10, 1670, AC, C 11A, 2:85; RAPQ, 1931, 126; NYCD, IX, 68.

[3] Mary of the Incarnation, 606; cf. Faillon, III, 246-247.

[4] "In St. Louis as late as the first decade of the American occupation, and, therefore, well into the nineteenth century, taxes were payable in deer skins at so much money value per pound," G. J. Garraghan, *Thought,* IV, 1929, 45.

[5] Cf. E. Salone, "Les sauvages au Canada et les maladies importées de France au XVII^e et XVIII^e siècle," in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris,* n. s., IV, 1907, 11. *Peter Kalm's Travels,* II, 472, 519.

[6] Lahontan, *New Voyages,* II, 574; cf. *Peter Kalm's Travels,* II, 519-521.

In exchange, the natives supplied the whites with the products of their industry or of their hunt, the last mainly beaver pelts. Naturally, the missionaries, living among the Indians, could make no transactions except according to this primitive economic system. While the Indians might give pelts to the missionaries, more ordinarily they supplied food and means of travel for whatever the Jesuits could give them in exchange. Although such goods were bartered, peltries remained the more ordinary medium of exchange,[7] because they could more easily be traded for other necessities, thanks to the warehouse in Quebec where all the pelts brought by the trappers had to be accepted at a set, invariable price, whether the furs were good or bad, thickly or thinly haired.

At the beginning, the Jesuits do not seem to have obtained peltries from the Indians, for we find Father Le Jeune sending some to the missionaries among the Hurons.[8] Later, when they bought their needed articles from the Indians or from the merchants, the missionaries gave pelts in exchange to the latter, trinkets to the former. The peltries they had exchanged with the Indians for attractive European goods were in turn exchanged with the merchants.

In order to avoid all misunderstanding about words in the texts which will be quoted hereafter, it should be noted that all the transactions indicated above were known under the generic name of *traite*. *Faire la traite* did not necessarily mean to be engaged in trade, in commerce; it also meant to make a trade of one product for another, to pay for one's needs with another product, in this case with pelts, the only general currency of the colony. But in France, whence the accusation of trade against the Jesuits originated, a small coterie of abbés totally ignorant of the economic conditions in the colony, jumped to the conclusion that *faire la traite* could only mean to carry on trade of a profitable and commercial nature.

---

[7] "Les pelleteries n'étant pas seulement en ce pays une marchandise, mais encore une espèce de monnaie dout on se sert ici pour toutes sortes d'achats et de commerces," Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, RAPQ, 1927, 19. "Cet officier en [peltries] donna en payement a quelqu'un; car c'estoit l'usage de s'en [peltries] servir au lieu de monnoye dans le pays." Perrot, *Memoire sur les Moeurs . . .*, 116.

[8] *Jesuit Relations*, 9, 175.

All this is perfectly known to the student of the beginnings of North America; it has been here restated to avoid any confusion which might arise from the use of words. The missionaries in these transactions did not buy the product to sell it and to profit by the sale, but to consume or to use it. If in exchange for merchandise bought from the dealers they gave in exchange a few beaver skins, which they had obtained from the Indians or the whites, these were the money of the country, the only money they could use, the only money they received for their services. Such transactions were not, have never been, and are not forbidden by the Church either to priests or religious.

Before 1636, the issue of trade by Jesuit missionaries in America had not been raised. Parkman, it is true, complacently pointed out as "noteworthy that the first contract of the French Jesuits in America relates to a partnership to carry on the fur-trade,"[9] and was at pains thereafter throughout his *French and English in North America* Series to find the Jesuits guilty of trade. He is referring to the *Contract d'Association des Jésuites au Traffique du Canada, 20 Janvier, 1611:* a contract which "occasioned much hostile comment against the Jesuits, whom their enemies accused of profiting by the Canadian trade."[10] It came about in this wise. Protestant merchants of Dieppe had contracted with Poutrincourt and his associates to equip and load a vessel destined to transport an expedition to America. The merchants, as might be expected, peremptorily refused to receive aboard the two Jesuit missionaries, Fathers Biard and Massé. Then it was that Madame de Guercheville became "indignant at seeing some insignificant peddlers so overbearing."[11] She raised 4,000 livres, bought out the interests of the two merchants, "establishing at the same time a sufficient capital from which there might each year be paid to the director of the Canadian undertaking an allowance for our mission."[12] By so doing, Madame de Guercheville had the intention of accomplishing two great benefits for New France:

---

[9] *Pioneers of France in the New World,* Boston, 1892, 294.
[10] *Jesuit Relations,* 3, 299.
[11] *Ibid.,* 175.

> The first was, that this would always be a good fund with which to maintain the Jesuits there, so that they would not be a burden to the Sieur de Poutrincourt, or any one else, nor would it be necessary to repeat every year the taking up of collections for them. The second was, that by this arrangement the profit from peltries and fish, which this ship would bring back, would not return to France to be lost in the hands of the merchants, but would redound to the interests of Canada, and there would remain in the possession and power of the Sieurs Robin and Poutrincourt, and would be used for the maintenance of Port Royal and the French residing there. For this reason, it was concluded that this money, having been applied and used for the benefit of Canada, the Jesuits would share with the Sieurs Robin and Biencourt, and by this association, would have a part in the profits which would be derived therefrom; the management and sales of said merchandise to remain with said Robin and Biencourt or their agents. This was the contract of partnership over which they have cried until they are hoarse, whether or not with reason, may be seen. God grant, that they never have greater cause to rail at us.[13]

Any one acquainted with the history of the missions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries knows how benefactors of the missions commissioned merchants to sell merchandise given them and to hand over proceeds to missionaries.[14] The procedure was in vogue to support the missionaries, and to enable them to carry on their work in pagan countries. However otherworldly their motives, missionaries could not live without food or raiment, and hence the above mentioned means of sustenance had been found practical. Today, Protestant and Catholic missionaries are given a check. The difference is accidental, and the means of support conditioned upon different economic conditions.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 2, 215.

[13] *Jesuit Relations*, 3, 175. Champlain wrote: "C'est ce contract d'association qui a fait tant semer de bruit, de plaintes, et de crieries contre les Peres Iésuites, qui en cela, et en toute autre chose se sont equitablement gouvernez selon Dieu & raison, à la honte et confusion de leurs envieux & mesdisans," *Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France Occidentale, dicte Canada,* Paris, 1632, part I, 101, *Oeuvres,* Laverdière ed., Quebec, 1870, V, 112. Cf. Charlevoix, I, 263, Faillon, I, 104, Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . . à l'histoire de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, 1872, 35-36, Rochemonteix, I, 35-36, Eastman, 2-6. The "outcries" referred to by Biard and Champlain are in Marc Lescarbot, *Relation dernière,* Paris, 1612. Parkman did not take the trouble to distinguish what Lescarbot says in his first edition, in a later edition, and in the *Relation dernière.* The "outcries" are also found in the anonymous *Factum du procès entre Jean de Biencourt, S^{r} de Poutrincourt et les Pères Biard et Massé, Jésuites,* an exceedingly rare pamphlet, reprinted in 1887, by Gabriel Marcel. The editor added an introduction which contains some instances of historical criticism he would have done much better to omit, cf. Rochemonteix, I, 81, note 4. For the probable author of the *Factum* cf. H. P. Biggar, *The Early Trading Companies of New France,* Toronto, 1901, 292-294.

The first accusation of trade in a commercial sense was launched against the Jesuit missionaries of New France, in 1636. It did not originate in the colony, but in France. The colonists who knew the economic conditions, understood the meaning of the expression *faire la traite,* and saw nothing wrong in this the only means of obtaining the needs of life. Father Le Jeune's letter of August 28, 1636, indicates the French origin of the accusation. His major superior in Paris, Father Binet, had written to Canada recalling to Le Jeune the ordinance of the Seventh General Congregation of the Society, which absolutely forbade all transactions under any pretext whatsoever, even those having only the semblance of commerce or negotiation. The French superior then had heard rumors. Other Jesuits in France heard the whispers of the campaigners, and they wrote to their brethren in Canada warning them to beware of so much as to cast a glance out of the corner of their eyes at beaver skins, or to touch them with the tip of their fingers. Something was in the air, thought the nonplussed missionaries. What, asked Le Jeune, can be the cause of the warnings?

> Surely it cannot be that our Society distrusts those it sends to these regions in regard to this matter any more than in a great many others. It seems to me I have heard that in France some who do not know us and do not wish to know us cry out that our hands are not clean of this traffic. May God bless them and make them understand the truth as I am about to utter it, if it is conducive to His glory. We cannot expect to serve long the

---

[14] F. X. de Ravignan, *De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites,* Paris, 1860, 192; Charlevoix, *Histoire du Paraguay,* Paris, 1756, III, pièces justificatives, 220.

Master we serve, without being slandered. These are His liveries, and He Himself would not recognize us, so to speak, if we did not wear them.

La Jeune hints at a whispering campaign going on in the motherland. The murmurers were in reality making an outcry. They were abbés in France, idling away time amid comfortable surroundings or passing the day in unhealthy political speculations. They had heard to their hypocritical sorrow of missionaries engaged in trade, and this from officials. The horror of the thing—priests violating Church law—penetrated hitherto unexplored recesses of righteousness within their souls! Their feeling of indignation swelled, the more so because of their close alliance with officials and tradesmen, who, by the bye, had volunteered the information on trade. France had sent officers to the colony, and these heard or said they heard and saw evidence of trade among the clergy, precisely what they had gone to see and hear. As tradesmen and officials they could not brook the sight of pelts in other hands than their own.

Le Jeune continues: "Now here is what I can write about it, with the same sincerity with which I would some day render an account to God of all my actions." He then explains the place of the pelts in the economic system of the young colony. Peltries, he says, are the coin of the greatest value. Day-laborers would rather receive their wages in this money than in any other. The usage made of pelts is twofold, either as a covering or as money. If skins occasionally come to the hands of the missionaries, they have no scruple to use them for "purchasing" something else, any more that they would have scruples to make shoes from the skins of moose, "that we may walk upon our snowshoes, for which the common ones are of no use whatever, because they are so hard." When the Jesuits in Quebec have some skins or beads, they send them to the missionaries in the Huron country; "it is the best part of their money, and with it they pay for their frugal provisions of Indian corn and smoked fish, as also for the materials and making of their bark palaces . . . This, in truth, is all the profit we derive here from peltries and other rare things of the country—all the use that we make of them."

Father Le Jeune's whole purpose was to justify his conduct and that of his brethren with his superior in Paris. Both he and his brethren, he wrote, are willing to drop the practice entirely in order not to offend any one.

> But if, on the contrary, you write us that all this is according to God, without semblance of traffic—although a few slanderers, about whom we should not trouble ourselves, may stir up their passions at it, and turn it into poison—we shall not fail to go on, after having entreated these same lugubrious and irritable natures to believe that, if it pleases them to make us give up this innocent practice, they must open their own coffers to assist us in these distant countries, after they have, through caprice, cut off a part of what was necessary to us.

Why, asked the missionary, should they be blamed for using the money of the country?

> If France were reduced to such a condition that money was not in circulation, one would be obliged in commerce to use the articles and commodities themselves, trading one for the other; or even if there were any profit in doing this beyond the mere necessity, and if such were the custom could any one find it wrong that, no matter what profession we make of poverty, we should follow the way of others, and when some objects of value should become ours, whether by purchase or donation—either in exchange or as a pure gift—we should make use of them according to circumstances . . . But who has ever imagined that it is trafficking to give and take according to the necessity of the ordinary occurrences of human life? Inasmuch as what you get in one place will exceed the value of what you have given for it in another place.

Father Le Jeune's aim was not to persuade the rigoristic coterie or other calumniators.

> For to consent to answer those who slander us, as if we were secretly making some other use of these skins and sending them to France, this would be making ourselves ridiculous. It is just as well to leave them something to say; and if they find ears ready to listen to these absurdities, I would be culpable in expecting to find them open to the truth. What then? Shall men who have given up greater worldly blessings than they could

hope for in the imaginations of these slanderers, finally decide to exchange France for Canada, to go there for the sake of two or three beaver skins, and to trade them off unknown to their Superiors—that is to say, at the expense of their consciences and of the loyalty they owe to Him, to imitate Whom they have so subjugated themselves that they cannot freely dispose of even a pin? *Credite posteri!*

Finally would the Company of the Hundred Associates, which had then the monopoly of trade in New France, close its eyes to a traffic in which it had more to lose than any? "But I am wasting my time and imposing upon your patience, in dwelling so long on what did not merit any answer."[15]

Preposterous and slanderous as the charge was, it was a mistake on the part of Le Jeune and the other Jesuits not to force the issue by calling upon their accusers for an itemized and categorical list of charges and by refuting them in detail. If this had been done, perhaps Parkman, and later one of his followers, Benjamin Sulte,[16] would have read the documents more carefully before perpetuating the legend of the abbés. There is no excuse for failing to see that Father Le Jeune called upon God to witness the truth of what he said, and moreover, *publishing* the same in the Relation of 1636. Some credence should have been given to his words, as opposed to those of pamphleteers anonymously basing assertions on and accepting the authority of some vague persons referred to as *"on."* Perhaps Le Jeune's retort was conclusive, for the abbés became silent for seven years on the matter. But after the death of Richelieu and Louis XIII, they once more found their voices. This time the cry of trader, hurled at the Jesuits, coincided with the condemnation of the *Augustinus,* and the revived accusation was answered by Father Vimont:

> Those who believe that the Jesuits go into this end of the world in order to make traffic of skins of dead beasts, account them very rash, and destitute of sense, to go and expose themselves

---

[15] *Jesuit Relations,* 9, 173-183.

[16] Sulte gave the measure of his prejudice in connection with these passages. To prove that the Jesuits in New France were engaged in trade, he quotes this emphatic denial of Father Le Jeune.

to such horrible dangers, for a benefit so sordid. It seems to me that they have more generous hearts; and that only God and the salvation of souls, can make them leave their native land, and the comfort of France, in order to go in quest of fires and torments in the midst of Barbarism. Forasmuch, nevertheless, as this error about commerce might slip into the minds of those who are not acquainted with them, it has been judged proper to affix here an authentic attestation, which will show how far they are removed from such thoughts.

Father Vimont continues his letter, inviting the abbés to come to Canada, where he felt they would "certainly change their tone." Immediately following the Relation of 1643 is the authentic attestation or declaration. It is made and undersigned by the Directors and Associates of the Company of New France. The signatories, having heard how certain persons, after persuading themselves, in order to disparage the work done by the Jesuits, circulate the report that the Jesuits had part in the shipments, returns, and commercial transactions of New France, wherefore the undersigned directors and associates of the Company of New France certify: "The Jesuit Fathers are not associated in the said Company of New France, directly or indirectly, and have no part in the traffic of merchandise which is carried on by it."[17]

Now with regard to this declaration Parkman wrote: "Its only meaning is, that the Jesuits were neither partners nor rivals of the Company monopoly."[18] Omitting a possible false implication, no one can cavil about this interpretation, since the fathers had no share in profits or capital of the company. But the implication is that the Jesuits did not answer other accusations. There were no other accusations at this time. Parkman continues his case: "They [the Jesuits] certainly bought supplies from its magazines with furs which they obtained from the Indians." They certainly did. How could they have bought anything except with pelts, the currency of the colony? To interpret such transactions as "trade" carried on by the Jesuits is an indication that Parkman *per fas et nefas* wanted to find the Jesuits at fault. Or perhaps Shea was not far wrong when he wrote to Parkman that he was uncritically following the lead of Margry,[19] a procedure very difficult to understand. Three times Parkman returned to the "trade of the Jesuits." Speaking in general of those who accompanied the Jesuit missionaries in the interior as laborers and defenders, he wrote

---

[17] *Jesuit Relations,* 25, 75-77; cf. Charlevoix, II, 168-169.

[18] *The Jesuits in North America in the XVIIth century,* Boston, 1912, 365, n. 1.

> Any inhabitant of Canada who chose to undertake so hard and dangerous a service was allowed to do so, receiving only his maintenance from the mission without pay. In return, he was allowed to trade with the Indian and sell the furs thus obtained at the magazine of the Company, at a fixed price. Many availed themselves of this permission; and all whose services were accepted by the Jesuits seem to have been men to whom they had communicated no small portion of their own zeal, and who were enthusiastically attached to their Order and their cause. There is abundant evidence that a large proportion of them acted from motives wholly disinterested. They were in fact *donnés* of the missions—given, heart and hand, to its services. There is probability in the conjecture, that the profits of their trade with the Indians were reaped, not for their own behoof, but for that of the mission.[20]

Several categories of men are being mixed up. The *donnés* did not trade. The *engagés* were summarily dismissed when they traded. A third class of men, those who brought the provisions to the distant posts, were allowed to trade. The profits constituted their pay, and there is not a single recorded instance of their turning over the profits to the missionaries.[21] After having made a jumble of these various classes of men employed by the missionaries, the historian, apparently eager to prove his point and thus establish a rival trading company for the element of conflict, had recourse to a conjecture based on a truncated passage of a letter of Father Ragueneau to Father Caraffa. Unless the profits accruing from the *donnés'* trade with the Indians were given to the mission, argued Parkman, it is difficult to explain the confidence with which the Father Superior, Ragueneau, speaks of the resources of the Huron mission.

---

[19] Parkman to Margry, January 30, 1870, in *Smith College Studies in History,* VIII, 1923, 129.

[20] *The Jesuits in North America,* 364-365.

[21] "After the destruction of the Huron nation by the Iroquois, the Jesuits cared for the refugees on the Island of Orleans. In 1651, they had spent 5,000 livres already and were expecting a new colony of Hurons. In order to provide for the expense," wrote Superior Ragueneau, "we shall use the peltry brought for them last year from their own country, which is worth 20,000 livres," *Jesuit Relations,* 36, 250. "Perhaps the men who had brought the peltries so far used by the Jesuits in caring for the shattered fragments of the Huron people were the lay brothers, the donnés of the mission, who were permitted to engage in commerce," Eastman, 85; Eastman refers the reader for the last statements to Faillon, II, 94, where nothing is said

According to Father Ragueneau, there were in the Huron mission eighteen fathers, four coadjutor brothers, twenty-three *donnés,* seven servants to whom alone wages were paid, four boys, and eight soldiers. Unless the missionaries were protected against the rage of the Iroquois, they would be destroyed in one hour. Besides affording protection, these men devoted themselves to both domestic duties and farm work, to building fortifications, and to military service. Previously the Jesuits had been protected by the Hurons from hostile attacks, but with these Indians dispersed and scattered by the fierce Iroquois, the missionaries had to defend themselves with their own strength, their own courage, their own numbers. He continues:

> This our dwelling—or shall I say our fort?—of Sainte Marie, the French who are with us defend, while our Fathers sally forth, far and wide, scattered among the villages of the Hurons, and through the Algonquin tribes far distant from us,—each one watching over his own mission, and intent only upon the ministry of the word, leaving all temporal cares to those who remain at home. In truth, domestic matters keep so fortunate a course that, although our number has increased, and we greatly desire new help to be sent us,—both of laymen and, especially of our own fathers,—still in no wise is it necessary to increase expenses. On the contrary, they are lessened daily, and each year we ask for less temporal aid to be sent us,—*so much so that we can, for the most part, support ourselves upon that which is here produced.* Verily, there is not one of our brethren who does not feel in this respect great relief from those distresses which were in former years very burdensome, and seemed insurmountable.

---

about lay brothers or *donnés,* but Faillon speaks of the third category of helpers employed by the Jesuits.

For we have larger supplies from fishing and hunting than formerly; and we have not merely fish and eggs, but also pork, and milk products, and even cattle, from which we hope for great addition to our store.[22]

Not one word about trade appears. What Father Ragueneau described was a farm begun by the missionaries in the Huron country, and their way of living on the products of the farm. The superior was alluding to the hard times in the early days of the mission, when Father Le Jeune was obliged to send a few moose skins to Father de Brébeuf and his companions to buy their frugal fare. How, from this passage in Father Ragueneau's letter, Parkman found that the "profits of the *donnés'* trade" were handed over to the mission is very difficult to see. He neglected to give the quotation as he found it in the letter of Father Ragueneau, and thus left out the explanation given by the Jesuit for his "confidence" with regard to the material resources of the mission. Parkman gives the following sentences in quotation marks, implying direct transcription from the letter: "Though our number is greatly increased, and though we still hope for more men, and especially for more priests of our Society, it is not necessary to increase the pecuniary aid given us." But in the next paragraph, as though the comment were his own, he says: "Much of this prosperity was no doubt due to the excellent management of their resources, and a very successful agriculture." The statement is nothing else than what Father Ragueneau says, without any "no doubt" added. The Jesuit gave a full explanation for his "confidence" in the sustaining qualities of the mission without having recourse to trade by fathers, brothers, *donnés,* and *engagés* alike. There was no excuse on Parkman's part for adding this "trade," nor can ignorance of economic affairs be claimed as an explanation of his so doing. The evidence, it must be said, was not presented correctly. Furthermore, from his footnote, "Their object evidently was to make the mission partially self-supporting," Parkman saw the implication contained in his incomplete quotation. The mystery is: where did he find that this self-support was conditioned on the trade of the *donnés,* who "probably" handed over to the missionaries the profits of their trade? Farming was not an occupation forbidden to missionaries, nor was there obloquy or moral censure attached to this method of supporting a mission.

---

[22] *Jesuit Relations,* 33, 253-255. Italics inserted. Eastman, 85, seems to have misread this passage of Father Ragueneau's letter. He writes: "Father Ragueneau assured the general that in spite of the increase in their numbers the Canadian Jesuits would not need any more pecuniary aid, a fact which suggests that they were paying part of their expenses by judicious barter." The reader may see whether it is question of the "Canadian Jesuits," or of those of Sainte-Marie only, and he may look for the "judicious barter" in what Father Ragueneau wrote.

> As vigilant and laborious people, they began to till the land to feed themselves and do without the supplies from France. Would to God that for the past twenty-three or twenty-four years, Societies had been actuated by the same spirit as these good Fathers. There would now be in the country several *habitations,* and the families would never have gone through the anxiety and apprehension they have experienced.[23]

"Even in the highest flights of his enthusiasm, the Jesuit never forgot his worldly wisdom."[24] It was not worldly wisdom, it was mere common sense. However, agriculture, the backbone of new countries, had little appeal to governors, officers, and explorers. They had come to New France not to colonize the country, but to get rich quickly by selling brandy to the Indians.

Parkman had, a second time, occasion to speak about the trade of the Jesuits. Speaking of the missionary stations, he says:

> It is evident that the priests had need of other hands than their own and those of the few lay brothers attached to the mission. They required men inured to labor, accustomed to the forest life, able to guide canoes and handle tools and weapons. In the earlier epoch of the missions, when enthusiasm was at its height, they were served in great measure by volunteers, who joined them through devotion or penitence, and who were known as *donnés,* or "given men." Of late, the number of these had much diminished; and they now relied chiefly on hired men, or *engagés.* These were employed in building, hunting, fishing, clearing and tilling the ground, guiding canoes, and, if faith is to be placed

---

[23] Champlain, *Oeuvres,* Laverdière ed., VI, 127-128.

[24] *The French Jesuits in North America,* 365, n. 1.

in reports current throughout the colony, in trading with the Indians for the profit of the missions. This charge of trading—which, if the results were applied exclusively to the support of the missions, does not of necessity involve much censure—is vehemently reiterated in many quarters, including the official despatches of the governor of Canada; while, so far as I can discover, the Jesuits never distinctly denied it; and on several occasions, they partially admitted its truth.[25]

The "many quarters" will be examined in turn. Suffice it to say, these quarters include mainly a few abbés in France, one Sieur Dumesnil and Sieur de la Salle. Parkman might well have observed some cautiousness in analyzing materials containing "vehement reiterations," and an attitude of healthy scepticism toward "official" despatches emanating in the disturbed officialdom of Canada would scarcely have been amiss. Yet, the manner in which the despatches of the governor of Canada are referred to leaves the impression that Parkman considered them authoritative and truthful. Perhaps the impression is erroneous, but this cannot be gainsaid: Parkman did not tell his readers that the governor of Canada was Frontenac, and Frontenac spoke of the trade of the Jesuits in one despatch alone. However, Parkman in this instance does not accuse the Jesuits themselves of trading, but rather the *engagés.* Whether the Jesuits countenanced such trade while these men were in their employ will be seen later.

Parkman manifests a certain progress in his thesis by coming back a third time to the "trade of the Jesuits." The qualifications found previously are forgotten. It is no longer the *engagés* or the *donnés* who trade, but the Jesuits themselves. After quoting from a letter to Frontenac, he wrote: "As I have observed in a former volume, the charge against the Jesuits of trading in beaver-skins dated from the beginning of the colony."[26] The charges will be presently examined in chronological order. When he wrote his *Old Régime,* he had in his possession the notorious *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée.* Why the historian accepted most of the statements contained in this diatribe remains a mystery; perhaps it was because he, like many another, was too much impressed by the "documents" supplied by Margry.

---

[25] *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West,* Boston, 1907, 38.

[26] *Old Régime,* 328, n. 1.

A few barrels of eels became the occasion for accusing the Jesuits of widespread trading and industrial activities. Parkman stated what he considered proof of trade, then wrote: "The Jesuits entered also into other branches of trade and industry with a vigor and address which the inhabitants of Canada might have emulated with advantage." These "other branches of trade" consisted, if the only example given is meant as a proof of the general statement, in the sale by the Jesuits in 1646 of several barrels of eels fished at Sillery.[27] One cannot help asking: Just what were the missionaries expected to do with a mess of fresh eels? Did the critics want them to throw the fish back into the river? What difference does it make whether one exchanges the products of the land or those of the water? The Jesuits of Canada owned their land and the riparian rights thereof, either through concessions or because they had bought it; they were also the tutors of the Indians who had been "granted" land and its rights, riparian and others, by the French government, and the missionaries took care of what rightfully belonged to their wards; they protected them against the rapacity of the colonial heroes. In Canada, at this time, neither did the officials, nor later, the officers, the "explorers," nor the disgruntled lawyers, consider such a transaction as trade, but the mercantile pursuits of which they accused the Jesuits consisted in commerce of furs.

Returning to the ending of the quotation given two paragraphs above, we note Parkman says the Jesuits never denied that the *engagés* traded. For this is what he meant in that passage. He did not say that the Jesuits never denied that they themselves were engaged in trade, but said "on several occasions, the Jesuits partially admitted its truth," namely, that the *engagés* traded. But his texts and the comments he added to them leave no doubt as to what he believed.

A good example of the tyranny of words is found in the first text used, probably "as a partial admission" on the part of the Jesuits that they were carrying on trade; at any rate, the text appeared as a "curious passage" to Parkman. It is found in "the private journal of Father Jerome Lalemant," under date of November 15, 1645.

---

[27] *Journal des Jésuites,* 69.

> The 15th of November—the rumor prevailing that the prohibition was about to be published here [Quebec] which had been published at Three Rivers, to the effect that no one was to trade with the Indians,—Father Vimont asked M. des Chastelets, general manager, whether we should be in worse condition under them than under Messrs. of the Company. The conclusion was that we would not, and that this matter should proceed for us as usual, but that we should carry it on quietly. Father Vimont added that we would notify Father Buteux, [who was at Three Rivers] and M. des Chastelets approved this.[28]

This passage ceases to be "curious" when it is remembered that in this year, 1645, a change took place in the trade monopoly of Canada. Henceforth, the inhabitants of the colony were to share with the Company of the Hundred Associates the profits of the trade. It was forbidden to exchange pelts directly with the Indians, or with the whites; and all the furs had to be brought to the Company's warehouses. The privilege granted to the Jesuits was that instead of exchanging with the Indians through the warehouse, they were allowed to do what they had been doing before, namely, to barter directly with the Indians or whites. This privilege, lest it be misinterpreted, was waived by the Jesuits themselves two years later. Anxious to remove even the appearance of trade, they discussed the matter among themselves, namely, two former superiors of the mission, Fathers Le Jeune and Vimont, who had written so vigorously denying that the Jesuits were engaged in trade, and Father Lalemant. The entry in the private journal of the Jesuits reads as follows:

> On the 19th [July 1647], another consultation was held, regarding the beaver trade carried on at Sillery, to wit, whether it should be tolerated. Father Le Jeune, Father Vimont, and I were present; and it was said:

---

[28] *Ibid.*, 13.

> 1. That if the warehouse were reasonable, it was an obligation in conscience not to divert them elsewhere.
> 2. That if it were not reasonable, people could in conscience frustrate the warehouse, for the inhabitants had the natural right confirmed by the king to trade.
> 3. That whether the warehouse were reasonable or not, we were not to trade.[29]

The translation given in Thwaites is inadequate, and so for that matter is the revised translation just given. The consultation was actually a case of conscience, proposed and discussed according to a rather common procedure in religious communities. The terms reveal this fact, but the fictitious case and the solution from moral principles were very pertinent to the affairs of the moment, and the conclusion indicates the correct moral procedure to be followed by the Jesuits. A new situation had arisen. In 1645 all pelts were to be brought to the warehouse of the reorganized Company. Eastman remarks:

> As we have said, the directors of the Community were rapacious. At this time they levied a toll of fifty per cent on all furs brought to their magazine . . . Evidently the Jesuits were willing to protect the humbler settlers against exploitations, and to feign ignorance when they smuggled their furs on board homebound ships in order to escape the excessive tax at the warehouse of Quebec.[30]

The tenants of Sillery, we may add, were bartering among themselves and with other settlers, using pelts as currency, without passing them through the warehouse of the Company, in virtue of the universal tendency to elude monopolistic regulations. The question had arisen whether this practice was justifiable before the moral law, as distinguished from the penal law. The answer of the Jesuits was that if the price paid by the warehouse was reasonable, people might not trade, exchange, barter, or smuggle their pelts out of the colony without passing through the warehouse. To this the inhabitants were bound in conscience, that is, under pain of sin. But should the Company abuse its privilege, levy too high a toll, then the right to trade given the inhabitants by the natural law, and confirmed by the king, must prevail, and it was deemed no sin to elude the monopoly. Clearly, the three Jesuits were considering a case of conscience they had met in their ministry. The first two divisions of the answer are set down in general terms: *on, les habitants,* these decisions were to be the norm followed by the confessors in directing their penitents. The third division of the answer shows this to be a natural interpretation of this entry in the Jesuit journal, that is, in effect, whether the warehouse was reasonable or not, we, the Jesuits, in contradistinction to the inhabitants, are not to exchange beaver-skins for other products, except through the warehouse.[31]

---

[29] *Ibid.,* 91-92; *Jesuit Relations,* 30, 187.
[30] Eastman, 84-85.

Nothing is heard about the charge for the next ten years. As in 1636, it was renewed in France. This time the occasion was the success of the Provincial Letters of Pascal, which appeared in 1656.[32] The Jansenist faction renewed the attack against the Canadian missionaries. The general of the Jesuits after a rigorous inquiry, wrote to the provincial of Paris, Father Cellot: "The accusation of trade levelled against our Fathers in the Canadian mission, had been found to be without the least foundation." And the same day, the general wrote to Father Le Jeune, then procurator of the Canadian missions in Paris: "I very much rejoice that our Fathers in the Canada mission have been cleared from that notorious accusation of trade which they were said to be engaged in."[33]

---

[31] Parkman, *Old Régime,* 328, note, has the following for 1647: "Two years after, on the request of Lalemant, the governor Montmagny, and his destined successor, Aillebout, gave the Jesuits a certificate to the effect that 'les pères de la compagnie de Jésus sont innocents de la calomnie qui leur a été imputée, et ce qu'ils en ont fait a été pour le bien de la communaute et pour un bon sujet.' This leaves it to be inferred that they actually traded, though with good intentions." No reference is given for this passage; the present writer has not found it, and lacking the context, he is unable to discuss it. Judging from Eastman, 85, who quotes it and refers to Parkman, he did not find the document either. Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens-Français,* V, 39, quotes the passage from Parkman, but does not even refer to the *Old Régime.*

[32] Charlevoix, II, 169.

[33] Cited in Rochemonteix, I, 353. Cf. *Relations inédites,* II, 344-345. Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . . ,* 303, professes to be astonished

We find an echo of this accusation in the Relation of 1657, the manuscript of which Father Le Jeune forwarded to the provincial of Paris. The Jesuits were entering the Iroquois country to reopen the missions among the Onondaga and the Mohawks. To dispose the Indians to receive the missionaries, presents were made to the chiefs. The narrator continues:

> It will not be out of place to observe in passing, that these presents consist entirely of wampum belts, arquebuses, powder and lead, coats, hatchets, kettles, and other similar articles. These are purchased from the merchants with beaver-skins, which are the money that they ask in payment for their wares. Now, if a Jesuit received or collects some of these furs, to help to pay the enormous expenses that have to be incurred in missions so distant, to win those peoples to Jesus Christ, and restore peace among them, it would be desirable that those very persons who ought to incur these expenses for the preservation of the country should, at least, not be the first to condemn the zeal of those Fathers, and in their tales, to paint them blacker than their gowns. They should leave slander of that kind to the low rabble, ever wrongly informed about what is going on, whose calumnies may be excused through ignorance. But let us do what is right, and allow evil to be said of us; for calumny is also the cement of virtue. They write to us from France that they can no longer provide means for the heavy expenditure that we incur in these new undertakings. We devote to them our labors, our sweat, our blood, and our lives. If, through lack of aid, we be compelled to abandon a post so advantageous for the Faith and for the preservation of the country, those who persecute us will be none the richer for it, and God will be less glorified.[34]

There is not very much originality in the accusation. The question is always the same. The rapacious merchants and the impecunious officers who had come to New France to "make their fortune," could not see pelts in the hands of other people without considering themselves victims of an injustice. The Jesuits had hatchets, needles, kettles, etc., with which to make presents to the Indians; they ex-

---

at the result of the investigation. He was easily astonished when the facts did not correspond to his preconceived ideas.

[34] *Jesuit Relations,* 43, 171.

changed pelts with the merchants for commodities and, therefore, they were engaged in business.

Parkman quotes a few lines from the passage, sufficient to prove the Jesuits engaged in the fur trade, and the charge not "wholly without foundation." He had little respect for the intelligence of his readers.[35] A further proof that the charge was not "wholly without foundation," is forthwith added. He quotes from the same Relation of 1657 two lines of the speech of Father Chaumonot to an assembly of Iroquois. Father Chaumonot "who spoke Iroquois as well as the natives,"[36] explained the meaning of the presents the missionaries and the French had brought, and with greater animation told the Indians:

> It is not for purposes of trade that you see us appear in your country. We aim much higher. Your furs are of too little value in our eyes to induce us to undertake so long, so difficult, and so dangerous a journey. Keep your beaver-skins, if you choose, for the Dutch; even those which may come into our hands will be used for your own good. We seek not perishable things. For the Faith, we have left our country; for the Faith, we have abandoned our relatives and our friends; for the Faith, we have crossed the Ocean; for the Faith, we have quitted the great ships of the French, to embark in your small canoes; for the Faith, we have given up fine houses, to lodge in your bark cabins; for the Faith, we deprive ourselves of our natural nourishment, and the delicate viands that we might have enjoyed in France, to eat

---

[35] Cf. Parkman to Margry, February 12, 1877, "It is unnecessary to remind you of the importance of indicating at the end of the third volume [of the *Découvertes et Etablissements*] at the latest, the provenance of all the documents. It is true that they speak for themselves, but there are few people intelligent enough or sufficiently educated to appreciate fully the testimony of their internal evidence, and anyway we must forestall all protests," *Smith College Studies in History,* VIII, 1923, 173. This is rather a summary manner of ruling out the most important section of external criticism. Parkman was unaware of the unsavory reputation Margry had among European scholars. Any document coming from Margry should have been doubly checked, its provenance stated beyond doubt, and the original or the copy compared with what Margry issued as a reproduction of the document. Cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 3-9. Sulte also thought and repeatedly asserted that he was one of the few chosen souls who could get the obvious or hidden meaning of the "documents," as he said, which documents consisted mainly in works which had been in print for a century when he wrote.

[36] *Jesuit Relations,* 43, 169; cf. Charlevoix, II, 262-264.

your boiled meal and other food, which the animals of our country would hardly touch.[37]

Indeed, even without documents, without prohibition on the part of the Church, without the regulations of their Order, no man in his senses will ever believe that the missionaries had abandoned their mother country, the comforts of home, had volunteered, even vowed, to come and live with the Indians, just to acquire a few beaver skins. Yet Parkman quotes two lines from this impassioned denial to prove that the Jesuits were engaged in trade: "Keep your beaver-skins, if you choose, for the Dutch; even those which may come into our hands will be used for your own good." How could the missionaries living in the Iroquois villages avoid using the currency of these villages? How could they prevent some beaver-skins from coming into their hands? Parkman never explained.

In December 1657 the provincial of the Province of Paris, told the general that the accusation had been renewed. The general answered: "In order that all occasions of just complaint be removed, Your Reverence must forbid our Fathers any kind of dealing in beaver skins which should have even the appearance of commerce." Father Renault replied that he would communicate this order to the missionaries in New France. The answer came from Father De Quen, dated Quebec, September 3, 1658: "They accuse us of I don't know what kind of traffic in pelts. It is false. As everybody else in the colony, we are using the pelts as a sort of common money for business transactions. We should hardly be able to procure the necessities of life otherwise, and we would be without the means to pay the salary of our workmen."[38]

---

[37] *Jesuit Relations,* 43, 175.

[38] Rochemonteix, II, 176, n. 2. "This warning [of the General] was none too effective, as an entry in their private Journal shows. Two Jesuits and seven other Frenchmen journeyed to the Ottawa region [in 1660]. Father Albanel and six others of the party ultimately returned to Montreal with thirty-five canoes and one hundred and fifty Indians. The Jesuits' merchandise had been faithfully bartered for beaver-skins, but the cost of the voyage exceeded the value of the beaver by 800 livres. From this entry it is clear that the Jesuits aimed at making their missionary enterprises pay for themselves," Eastman, 86. The two texts, *Journal des Jésuites,* 287, 320, on which the above statements are based are hardly to the point.

When Laval arrived in Quebec in 1659, he hinted in his letter to the general of the Jesuits at the identity of the accusers.[39] The remonstrances of the Jesuits, to which those of the bishop were soon to be added, angered the brandy peddlers,[40] who waxed vociferous and became as prolific in memoir writing as the idle abbés in France. Nowhere does the bad art of backbiting flourish better than in small towns. At the beginning of the second half of the seventeenth century, Quebec was and so remained for a long time after a small village. There all too frequently neighbor eyed neighbor; one misinterpreted the actions of the other, and criticized him accordingly, both verbally and in writing. Backbiting had reached such proportion, tongue wagging apparently had become so endemic, that Mary of the Incar-

---

The question was how such protracted sojourn in the West was to be financed. The answer is given in the Journal of the Jesuits. Those in Quebec bought merchandise which *the Frenchmen of the expedition exchanged,* and the profits were used for the upkeep of the missionaries. It was something similar to what took place in the East, with the difference that in Canada the Jesuits themselves in this particular case had bought the merchandise with money or goods given them by benefactors of the missions, whereas in the East the Portuguese merchants were given merchandise directly by the king or by benefactors, and the merchants were to sell it for a profit to be handed to the missionaries, cf. *supra,* 138, n. 14. The case against the Jesuits must be a weak one when such texts have to be appealed to. Elsewhere, Eastman, 177, wrote: "Even when the Jesuits were not accused of trading directly they sometimes appeared as accomplices. For instance, in 1681, the Council made a seizure of the furs and merchandise belonging to a strolling trader who had carried on illicit commerce at the Sault. The goods were found in the possession of Father Frémin." The reference given is *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 620. The word "sometimes" is too strong for the lone instance cited. Again, Father Frémin was deceived with regard to the status of the man who left his goods with him. One Defaye had traded at the Prairie de la Madeleine, had left his goods, money and everything with the Superior of the mission. It was found out that he was a *marchand forain,* and as such had no right to trade with the Indians. His goods were seized by the police where he had left them, that is, at the mission where he had been trading. In the subsequent hearings of the case the accused tried to prove that he was not a *marchand forain,* but was merely a salesman for his uncle who was a *résident* of Quebec and who as resident had the right to trade with the Indians at the Sault. Eastman makes Frémin "appear" as an accomplice, even though the police at the time did not. Cf. *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 687, 706, 874-875.

[39] Gosselin, I, 245.

[40] Cf. L. H. Chevalier de Baugy, *Journal d'une expédition contre les Iroquois en 1687,* Paris, 1883, 153. This comprises the Journal and the letters written by Baugy. The *Journal,* but not the letters, has been translated in English by Nathaniel S. Olds under the title *Journal of Chevalier de Baugy,* Rochester, 1931.

nation called the plague of slanders more harmful to the colony than all the attacks of the Iroquois.[41]

What Baugy wrote about the Canadians applied much more to his brother officers than to the great majority of the *habitants*. In a letter written to his brother shortly after his arrival in Quebec, he said: "With regard to the French who are born in this country, one can hardly know them. They are all much double-faced; in some ways they take after the Indians. I do not deem fit to tell you here all that I think of them."[42] But Baugy said what he thought in a strictly confidential letter to his brother a month later: "I shall tell you that with regard to the people of this country they are much double faced; they take after the Indians, great talkers, who for the most part do not know what they are talking about. Most of them claim also to be noblemen. As they do not in the least agree with one another, you should hear them talk about one another. They compete to see who will outdo the other in backbiting, and it is not necessary to put them on the rack to know all things."[43] Lahontan puts the following words in the mouth of Adario: "Lying and Slandering your Brethren, is a thing that you can as little refrain from as Eating and Drinking. I never heard four *French-Men* converse together, without speaking ill of some body; and if you knew what I have heard 'em say publicly of the Viceroy, the Intendant, the Jesuits, of a thousand People that you know, not excepting your Self, you would be convinced that the *French* are very well vers'd in Defamations."[44] "They write quantities of falsehoods against the holiest and the most virtuous," said Mary of the Incarnation.[45]

With this in mind a historian has to be very chary of evidence taken from *"on."* Only a small part of what they wrote is extant. Until the date now reached, all the references are either to the Jesuit Relations or to letters in the Jesuit Archives.

---

[41] Mary of the Incarnation, 541, 544.
[42] Baugy, *Journal,* letter of October 27, 1682, 151.
[43] *Ibid.,* letter of November 22, 1682, 152.
[44] Lahontan, *New Voyages,* II, 536, cf. I, 281.
[45] Mary of the Incarnation, 544.

It is not surprising that before 1663, so few original documents concerning the history of Canada are found in the Archives of the Colonies in Paris. We must not forget that only this year Canada began to be administered by the royal government and only then did Colbert think of gathering the documents sent from the colonies or the despatches sent thither by the government. Champlain, Montmagny, d'Ailleboust, de Lauzon, d'Argenson, d'Avaugour, depended on the Companies rather than on the king. It is in the archives of the former Company of the Hundred Associates that most of the papers of these governors should be found. But where have these archives gone? Where have the registers containing the minutes of the meetings of this Company gone?[46]

After 1663, not only does one find more information in the archives of Paris, but also in the registers of the Sovereign Council in Quebec. The year following the creation of this body, the minutes show the Jesuits of Canada replying by proxy to the old accusation of trade. On November 26, 1664, before the Council assembled, Martin Boutet made a declaration on behalf of the Jesuit Fathers, stating that they

> never made profession of selling, and have never sold anything whatever. The merchandises they gave to private persons were only for the purpose to get their necessities. At present they have nothing left, except for alms, and for the necessities of their own house. If some work has to be done, they will have to pay the workmen with wine, brandy, or with the products of the colony, with cash or with drafts on the merchants.[47]

According to his custom, Parkman quotes a few words from this declaration, and adds, "this is an admission in a thin disguise. The word *necessités* is of a very elastic interpretation."[48] It is indeed, an "admission," but not the one indicated by Parkman, for in the context, clearly he meant an admission of guilt on the part of the Jesuits.[49] It is an

---

[46] J.-E. Roy, *Rapport sur les Archives de France relatives à l'histoire du Canada,* Ottawa, 1911, 445; cf. *Report on Canadian Archives for 1899,* Supplement, Ottawa, 1901, 18, Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . . , Introduction,* iii, ff.

[47] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 300-301.

[48] *Old Régime,* 328.

[49] "In brief, the Jesuits of Canada had not made a business of fur trading, but they had traded in furs as circumstances required,"

"admission" that the Jesuits could not live on fresh air and clear water; it is an admission that the Jesuits had to barter, had to pay in the currency of the colony for their *necessités,* which meant then as it means now, the primary necessities of life. What those merchandises spoken of in the declaration were will be seen later. Parkman fitted the word *necessités* to his thought; it meant no more to the missionaries than the bare necessities. He perhaps had Michelet in mind when he penned this elastic interpretation of the word *necessités;* according to Michelet the Canadian missionaries were leading a sybaritic life. From a passage of Lahontan,[50] Michelet learned there was an ice-box in the college of Quebec!

The next text stretched on the Procustean bed by those determined to fortify the case against the Jesuits is taken from the Journal of the Jesuits, under the date August 17, 1665. The entry reads:

> Father Frémin is returning as Superior to the Cap de la Madeleine, where the temporal affairs of the mission are in good condition. *Comme il est delivré de tout soin d'aucune traite,* he is to apply himself to the instruction of the Montagnais and of the Algonquins; in such a manner, however, that Father Albanel is to continue in charge of the chief care of this mission.[51]

Eastman, 87, should read "but they paid with the coin of the colony for what they bought."

[50] "These Fathers have very convenient and large Apartments, beautify'd with pleasant Gardens, and several rows of Trees, which are so thick and bushy that in the Summer one might take their Walks for an Ice-House: And indeed we may say without strechting that there is Ice not far from 'em, for the good Fathers are never without a reserve in two or three places for the cooling of their Drink," Lahontan, *New Voyages,* I, 43. The shady walks were "the remains of the forest which stood here when the French began to build this town [Quebec]," *Peter Kalm's Travels,* II, 448; and the cool drinks which he seems to begrudge were common in Canada even in those days, for it was "customary to put a piece of ice into the water or wine which is to be drunk," *ibid.,* II, 499. According to Hennepin, La Salle also expatiated on the sybaritism of the Jesuit missionaries in India, *New Discovery,* II, 415. Speaking of the fare of the Jesuits, Parkman had written previously, "It is by no means to be inferred that the household [in the Huron mission] fared sumptuously. Their ordinary food was maize, pounded and boiled, and seasoned, in the absence of salt, which was regarded as a luxury, with morsels of smoked fish," *The Jesuits in North America,* 366. Cf. Baugy, *Journal d'une expédition,* 181.

[51] *Journal des Jésuites,* 333.

Quoting about half of this entry, Parkman italicized the French words as done above. He then explains that "Father Albanel was charged, under Frémin, with the affairs of the mission, including doubtless the temporal interests, to the prosperity of which Father Le Mercier alludes, and the cares of trade from which Father Frémin was delivered."[52] Parkman knew very little about the internal organization of the Order about which he wrote very much. The entry merely means that Father Frémin was superior and Father Albanel procurator of the mission. The latter office included the task of looking after the temporal interests, such as preventing the French from cheating the Indians, acting as tutor for the red men, interposing himself between the greed of the merchants and the easily deluded natives. Such was the *soin de traite* alluded to by Father Le Mercier. The procurator was supposed to buy, exchange the products of the farm, and pay with beaver-skins for services rendered, making the permutations to obtain from the merchants all needful things for the missionaries and for their white workmen, all of which was known under the generic name of *traite*. The cares of the "trade," as Parkman interpreted the word, existed only in his imagination.

The "trade of the Jesuits" was fast becoming an *idée fixe* with Parkman. The entry from the Journal of the Jesuits is given as a "reasonably clear" explanation of the passage in the so-called 1667 memoir, supposedly written by Talon. The memoir has been examined. It was pointed out how a few months before this memoir was supposedly written, Talon had gone to Montreal, how he had visited every house on the island, inquired about everything; how on his return journey from Montreal to Quebec he also visited the Cap de la Madeleine, near Three Rivers. How will one find in this text a proof that the Jesuits traded? How will they explain that in the whole extant correspondence of the intendant, in all the letters signed by him, in all the documents certainly written under his direction, there is not a single reference to the trade of the Jesuits? How will they explain that when Talon returned from this visit to the Cap de la Madeleine where according to these historians he suspected the Jesuits of being engaged in trade and of making such great profits, the intendant promptly paid the Jesuits 5,000 livres,[53] the full amount of the subsidy granted by the king, which he had previously paid in two installments?[54] Can it be reasonably supposed that Talon, who had so much at heart the interests of the king and the preachments of Colbert on strict economy, would have parted with 5,000 livres of the king's money to help men who were carrying on such a prosperous and lucrative commerce?

---

[52] *Old Régime,* 329.

When Talon first went to Canada, the king and Colbert were aware of the charge of trade. Mézy had sent his accusations to the king; copies had been made and communicated to the governor's friends in France. Some of these copies had found their way back to Canada. In the request for a juridical investigation of the charges, which Father Le Mercier addressed to Tracy, Courcelle, and Talon, the first article deals with the subject. Father Le Mercier humbly begged these gentlemen to inquire

> Whether it be true that the Bishop and the Jesuit Fathers are making use of a secret and adroit means to enrich themselves, which is to sell brandy to the Indians in exchange for their pelts, thus shutting the inhabitants out of the fur trade. [Whether it be true that the Bishop and the Jesuit Fathers] have turned their respective houses, as well as three or four houses of the members of their cabal, into shops where more trade is carried on than in the whole of Canada, which makes many people murmur, but about which no one dares speak for fear of the Bishop and of the Jesuits who hold the people in captive subjection.

The Jesuit asked M. de Mézy, or all those who make his accusations their own, to prove them juridically, failing which they be branded as calumniators. Although the Jesuits were entitled to bring suit against Mézy as a public defamer, all that they asked was a publication of the truth as well in Canada as in France, and a complete cleansing of their escutcheon from the calumnies of the said Sieur de Mézy.[55]

---

[53] *Journal des Jésuites,* 356.
[54] *Ibid.,* 337, 338.

The petition is dated May 8, 1666. How Father Le Mercier was persuaded by Tracy not to push the matter against Mézy has been noted. The viceroy, the governor, and the intendant had written to Paris justifying the Jesuits' actions. This condescension was all the more deplorable since at this very time Sieur Dumesnil was repeating the accusations for which a juridical investigation was requested. "According to Peronne Dumesnil, *Mémoire de 1671,* the Jesuits had at that time more than 20,000 francs a year, partly from trade and partly from charitable contributions of their friends in France."[56]

Jean Peronne Dumesnil had arrived in Canada in 1660.[57] He had been sent to disentangle the hopelessly muddled accounts of the Company of the Hundred Associates. He arrived beaming with dignities, for he was at once general comptroller, intendant, and judge. A former *avocat au Parlement de Paris,* a prototype of Brid'oison, he soon discovered that *la fooorme,* that many technical formalities had been dispensed with in the account books. He indulged in diatribes not only against the accountants, but against the councillors, the governor, the religious communities, the Jesuits, and the bishop. To obtain the account books, he forced the house of the notary where they were kept. Villeray, one of the councillors, was commissioned by the Council to get them back. Accompanied by the attorney-general, two sergeants, a locksmith, and ten soldiers, Villeray went to the house of Sieur Dumesnil. The *avocat au Parlement* shouted "robbers," was gagged, overpowered by the soldiers, and tied up, while Villeray retrieved the papers the Sieur Dumesnil had stolen. Fearing for his own safety, the gentleman hurriedly embarked for France, where he wrote his memoir.[58]

---

[55] Rochemonteix, II, 528-529.

[56] *Old Régime,* 329. The date of the memoir given by Parkman is faulty; its author died in 1667, and hence could not have written it in 1671, cf. BRH, XXI, 1915, 163.

[57] *Journal des Jésuites,* 287; *Jesuit Relations,* 45, 163.

[58] BRH, XXI, 1915, 161 ff., Ferland, *Cours d'histoire du Canada,* Quebec, 1861, I, 499-500; Garneau, *Histoire du Canada,* Quebec, 1859, I, 163; *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 4, 6, 27, 135, 136.

This affair is narrated at great length by Parkman in his *Old Régime*. He noted "the few mistakes I have been able to detect in his long memorials."[59] As regards Dumesnil's charges, Parkman concluded his chapter, saying

> The truth seems to be, that the financial managers of the colony, being ignorant and unpractised, had kept imperfect and confused accounts, which they themselves could not always unravel; and that some, if not all of them, had made illicit profits under cover of this confusion. That their stealings approached the enormous sum [3 million livres] at which Dumesnil places them is not to be believed. But, even on the grossly improbably assumption of their entire innocence, there can be no apology for the means, subversive of all justice, by which Laval enabled his partisans and supporters to extricate themselves from embarrassment.[60]

Laval's share in this affair does not concern us. Parkman here as in many other places is merely airing his anti-Catholic prejudices, his target being either Laval or the Jesuits. His picture of the Jesuits at a bungling unconsequential trade would make them appear stupid indeed. What is not said is how Dumesnil obtained the account books. This is glided over and hurriedly disposed of by saying: "That Dumesnil had obtained certain papers unlawfully from the *greffe* or record office."[61] The passage in which Dumesnil accuses the Jesuits of trade says that the revenue of Canada amounts to 48,000 livres, while

> The expenses are only 21,000 livres, namely, 10,000 livres for the Governor of Quebec; 3,000 livres for the Governor of Three Rivers; and 3,000 livres for the Governor of Montreal. Out of these sums, the governors pay their soldiers. Plus 5,000 livres for the pension of the Jesuits. At the time when the ordinance [of the Council of State, March 5, 1648] was issued, all they had was the said pension. But they have been given since a revenue of 12,000 livres per annum, from the lands granted to them in Canada, over and above all this they make more than 20,000

---

[59] "His claims," wrote Eastman, 51, "were grossly exaggerated, perhaps quite false."

[60] *Old Régime,* 143.

[61] *Ibid.,* 139.

livres a year from their traffic and trade, from the pensions and alms sent them from France.[62]

Although this memoir was addressed to Colbert, Colbert did not stop the pension granted to the Jesuits, nor the following year in the instructions to Talon did he mention the trade carried on by them. The charge was simply beyond anybody's credence. In this same memoir, "which contains few mistakes," Dumesnil had asserted that Laval, helped by Ragueneau, had opened a liquor shop in Quebec and had monopolized the trade. Yet in the protracted fight between the bishop and the minister about the brandy trade, Colbert never once alluded to this alleged reason why Laval and the Jesuits were opposed to the traffic. Colbert was not a defender of the Jesuits. He recognized such accusations for what they were. Still these vagaries have been seriously adduced as proofs that the Jesuits were fur traders in New France by a historian who compensates for what he lacked in critical spirit by the magic of a literary style.

A pastime, albeit one to which smaller minded officials might turn, was enjoyed by the governors, intendants, commandants, and civil officials of Canada, and this was sending to Paris the bank account of other people. They knew to the last farthing the exact income of everybody else. The balance sheets they drew up invariably showed a huge sum on the credit side of the ledger, and very little expense on the debit side.

When Dumesnil wrote his memoir he evaluated the revenue of the Jesuits in Canada for 1603-1664 at well over 37,000 livres. Father Ragueneau, then procurator of the Canada mission in Paris, on July 1, 1665, sent an exact account of the financial status of the mission to the general of the Order. It contains the certain revenue affected to the whole mission. The endowment money was in part loaned to Jesuit colleges in France, paying ordinarily 5% interest, in part invested in municipal or government bonds. The net balance of this total revenue amounted to 8,308 livres. Father Ragueneau added a note saying:

---

[62] "Mémoire concernant les affaires du Canada," *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXI, 1915, 197.

> The alms sent for our missionaries or for the neophyte Indians are uncertain, sometime we receive more alms, sometime less. For this reason I did not enter them in this account.
> I included in the said alms 600 livres which the king allows us on the custom duties; of which 50 livres are for the Ursulines of Quebec, and 50 livres for the *Hospitalières,* and so we only receive 500 livres, but all this is very uncertain.[63]

If these 500 livres are added to the total certain revenue, the sum of 9,000 livres is reached. The reason for not including the 5,000 livres pension granted by Louis XIV is obvious. This pension depended on the king's pleasure and was not more certain than the alms. If this sum is added to the rest, the total is 14,000 livres, and the alms spoken of by Father Ragueneau hardly amounted to 23,000 livres, which would be necessary to make the 37,000 livres spoken of by Sieur Dumesnil. With this revenue, the superior of the mission had to provide food, clothes, shelter for 35 priests and brothers, for as many *donnés.* He had to pay the *engagés,* buy farm implements, help the needy neophytes, distribute alms. It is only when the debit side of the ledger is taken into consideration that the untold riches of the Canadian Jesuit missionaries at a time when they were supposed to be rolling in wealth can be truly appraised.[64]

In Europe the question of trade by missionaries was again debated when the Bull *Sollicitudo Pastoralis,* June 17, 1669, was promulgated. In it Pope Clement IX revoked certain permissions granted by his predecessors to missionaries and withdrew the authorization to perform certain acts which, without being commercial transactions, might give rise to suspicion.[65] Devised to protect from calumnies missionaries all over the world, it had the opposite effect with regard to the Jesuits. The anti-Jesuit clique in Paris used the bull of Clement IX as evidence of Jesuit trade. The general of the order sent a copy of the bull to Father Jerome Lalemant, then superior of the missions of Canada, ordering him to conform to the order of the pope. After having examined the bull, Father Lalemant replied there was no need to change anything in the mode of selling and buying practiced by the Jesuits in Canada; in this there was no shadow of trade; he did not think Clement IX wished to forbid such transactions; the pope had no right to forbid them, because the preservation of one's life and the legitimate means thereto is a natural and divine precept, which no human being can abrogate. The Jesuits did not seek enrichment, but merely sustenance. However, if such exchanges are now forbidden, and if the Pope condemns them and prohibits their continuation, he and all his brethren are ready to abandon the missions in New France. "But who can believe that in this colony, where for lack of specie, buying and selling is ordinarily done by exchange, it is the intention of the legislator to make it illicit for us to procure by exchange from those among whom we live, whether they be barbarians or French?"[66]

---

[63] ASJ, Gal., I, 110, 39.

[64] On the riches of the Jesuits, cf. the report of Laval to the Pope, 1660, quoted in Gosselin, I, 250. In 1664 Dablon wrote to the General that thus far they had been able to avoid debts, but if they should build a church as they were thinking of doing, they would necessarily have to borrow money, Dablon to Oliva, August 26, 1664, ASJ, Gal., 110, I, 36.

[65] Constitutio prohibens Mercaturam et Negociationes seculares Ecclesiasticis praesertim Religiosis quibuslibet in Indiis Orientalibus, et Amaerica nunc et pro tempore existentibus, *Bullarum . . . Romanorum Pontificum Amplissima Collectio,* Rome, 1762, VI, Pars Sexta, 344-346.

SECTION 2. FRONTENAC'S INDICTMENT

It is time to gather up a few threads from the past pages in order to view the position of Frontenac with relation to the charge against the Jesuits. Parkman's thesis has been examined in detail, except for one phase. The accusation of trading, he had said, "is vehemently reiterated in many quarters, including the official despatches of the governor of Canada."[1] When the ground for such a generalization is considered, it narrows down to one statement in one despatch of one governor, the Sieur de Frontenac. Quite surprisingly, Parkman said nothing on the matter in his study of the governor. But in this latter work, when discussing the brandy question, one quotation is given as it appeared in a letter of the "most noted of Canadian governors, to serve as an example"[2] of those accusations. The "official despatches" wherein the charge is insinuated and that in which it is openly made must now be examined in chronological order.

---

[66] Cited in Rochemonteix, I, 357, n. 1, 358, n. 2 and 3.

[1] Parkman, *La Salle,* 38.

Frontenac, as has been said, arrived and ensconced himself in Quebec, and before he could possibly have become acquainted with conditions, wrote in cipher to Colbert that the aim of the Jesuits was as much the conversion of beaver as it was of Indians.[3] This was in November 1672. Colbert deemed the statement unworthy of answer. In 1673 the governor's long epistle makes no mention of Jesuit trade; he was too busy with the frenchification scheme and with the reserved case of brandy selling. In 1674 he wrote of the Jesuits' lack of enthusiasm for the plan of amalgamating Indians and French, and of the frankness with which the missionaries said they were not come to be curés of French parishes but rather to care for Indians, or, he coyly added in cipher, " 2 20 20 2 39 18 68 17 239," "to gather up beavers."[4] A postscript explains an incident which took place at Sault Ste. Marie. There Kilistinou [Cree] Indians had killed ten or twelve Sioux, "who apparently had come to the Sault to bring their beaver pelts to the Jesuits rather than seek baptism."[5] If Frontenac hoped to receive congratulations on his wit, he was destined to be disappointed. The minister ignored the jibes in his reply.[6]

---

[2] *Old Régime*, 328.

[3] Frontenac to Colbert, November 2, 1672, AC, C 11A, 3:247; Margry I, 248; RAPQ, 1927, 20. It would be quite naïve to look for originality in the letters of the governor. This inane statement had been in print two score years before he sent his ciphered passage to Colbert: "Le General Quer [Kirk] parlant aux Peres Iesuistes, leur dit, Messieurs vous auiez l'affaire de Canada, pour iouir de ce qu'avoit le sieur de Caen, lequel auez depossedé. Pardonnez moi Monsieur (luy dit le Pere) [Brébeuf] ce n'est que la pure intention de la gloire de Dieu qui nous y a mené, nous exposant à tous dãgers et perils pour cet effect, & la conversion des Sauuages de ces lieux: ledit Michel pressant dit, Ouy, ouy cõvertir des Sauuages, mais plustost pour conuertir des castors, ledit Pere respond assez promptement & sans y songer, Celà est faux, l'autre leue la main, en luy disant, sans le respect du General ie vous donnerois un souflet, de me desmentir, le Pere luy respond, Vous m'excuserez, ie n'entend point vous desmentir, i'en serois bien fasché, c'est un terme de parler que nous auons en nos escoles, quand on propose vne question douteuse, ne tenant point cela pour offencer, c'est pourquoy ie vous prie me pardonner, & croire que ie me l'ay point dit pour vous donner du desplaisir." Champlain, *Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France Occidentale, dicte Canada,* Paris, 1632, II, 261, *Oeuvres,* Laverdière ed., VI, 288-289. Jacques Michel was a French Calvinist from Dieppe sold to the English. His fury on being given the lie by Father de Brébeuf is typical. Most of the "colonials" lacked the most elementary respect for truth. When those whom they maligned defended themselves, they went into tantrums.

[4] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, AC, C 11A, 4:80; RAPQ, 1927, 75.

The king also saw Frontenac's letter of November 14, 1674. He wrote a week after Colbert, speaking at length of the clergy of Canada, of the beaver trade with the Indians, but said not a word about the alleged trade of the Jesuits.[7] Nor is there mention of their traffic in the instructions of Duchesneau, drafted a month later.[8] But in the letter Colbert sent May 30, 1675, the same day the intendant's instructions were drafted, the minister's first warning to Frontenac is found. The accusations of "the most noted of the governors of Canada" against the Jesuits had been ignored by the king and by the minister, but reports that Frontenac himself was guilty of the very misdeed of which he accused others had reached the Court. Colbert wrote:

> His Majesty further ordered me to tell you in secret, that although he did not believe what was said here that some trade and pelt traffic was being carried on in your name, yet, you must beware lest any of your servants or any person who is near you carry on such trade. It would be impossible for the colonists to be persuaded that you will protect them and render them the impartial justice which you owe them, as long as they see a few persons who have private access to you engage in trade.[9]

As noted before, there is a gap of several years in Frontenac's correspondence. His letter is not extant for 1675. But the governor's counter to the accusation is deduced from the answer the king dated April 15, 1676:

---

[5] AC, C 11A, 4:83; RAPQ, 1927, 77.

[6] Frontenac undoubtedly repeated his *bon mot* before his creatures at Quebec, before the members of his household, which was, should we believe Le Clercq, "a seminary of virtue," II, 78, "military virtues," chuckled Lorin, 28; on the "virtues" practiced in that seminary, see La Tour, 206. There is a variant of the ciphered passage in one of La Salle's, Margry, II, 251, and in one of Cadillac's letters.

[7] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 22, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 80-83.

[8] Instructions pour M. Duchesneau, May 5, 1675, Clément, III^2, 594-600.

[9] Colbert to Frontenac, May 30, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 85.

> With regard to what you say about the ease with which the ecclesiastics, secular and regular, carry on the fur trade by means of the missions, you and Sieur Duchesneau must devise the means to prevent it. You should not find this very difficult if markets are held at stated times, or by means of police regulations. Send the information to me and in case you need make use of my authority, I shall give the necessary orders to that effect. . . . With regard to commerce and trade, I am pleased to tell you that you must not tolerate any dignitary, ecclesiastic or civil, or any community to engage in it, even in fur trading *[la traite des pelleteries]* under any pretext whatever. I do not think it necessary to tell you to show the good example, and not tolerate that your servants or any other person make use of your name or of your authority to carry on any kind of trade, and I even forbid you to grant any trade permit.[10]

Before 1675, Frontenac had implied that the Jesuits were trading. Judging from the letters written by the king and the minister in 1676 to the governor as well as from those written by Colbert to Duchesneau the same year, it appears that Frontenac's letters of 1675 also contained accusations of trade against the "ecclesiastics" of Canada, couched in broad but safely damnatory statements which could not be met with either proof or denial. But in the late summer of 1676, the ships brought to Canada the royal ordinance of April 15 of that year, which forbade any to go fur trading in the Indian settlements.[11] Just as later the brandy ordinance of 1679 was to incense Frontenac, so did the ordinance of 1676. The letter of the king, which is cited above, contained, as can be seen, an express prohibition directed to Frontenac himself from ever granting "aucun congé ny permission pour la traite." The trade ordinance was engrossed in the registers by the Sovereign Council October 5, 1676.[12]

Three weeks later Frontenac sent a letter to Colbert in which he accuses the Jesuits outright of being engaged in trade. The present writer did not find this letter. Parkman had a copy of it, and so had Rochemonteix. The American gave one sentence in direct quotation, and the Jesuit printed what seems to be a comprehensive summary. Careful search made in Paris failed to locate the letter. Personal investigations in the Archives of Ottawa and Quebec, among the papers of Rochemonteix in Montreal and among those of Parkman in Boston were equally fruitless.

---

[10] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 15, 1676, RAPQ, 1927, 88. Cf. letter of Colbert to Duchesneau, of the same date in Clément, III², 607-608.

[11] *Edits,* I, 86.

[12] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 73, 75.

The Jesuits, Frontenac claimed in this letter, have increased their immense influence by all available means. In the missions, they proclaim themselves equal to Onontio. They meddle in all civil affairs either directly or indirectly. All who oppose them, even the governor or the Recollects, are the victims of their boundless ambition. They own vast land estates, magnificent seignories, and they are still asking for more land. They say it is for the Indians, but in reality they intend to appropriate these lands for themselves later on. They are the absolute masters of a few members of the Sovereign Council, the bishop, and the intendant, and these do nothing without the Jesuits' cooperation, and only carry out what has their approval. They have urged the prelate to make use of ecclesiastical sanctions against the brandy sellers. "They greatly exaggerate the disorders caused by brandy, and they easily convince persons who do not know the interested motives which have led them to harp continually on this string for more than forty years. . . . They have long wished to have the fur trade entirely to themselves, and to keep out of sight the trade which they have always carried on in the woods, and which they are carrying on there now."[13] They even go so far as to trade with the New Englanders.[14]

How much of these charges Colbert believed can be seen from the answer sent by the minister to the governor and to the intendant in 1677, as well as from the letter of Louis XIV of April 28. Judging from the king's reply, Frontenac had not been as specific in his letter to the king of October 30, 1676, that is, on the day after he had written to Colbert, as he had been in that written to the minister. Louis XIV wrote:

---

[13] *Old Régime,* 328.
[14] Rochemonteix, III, 137-138.

> I am surprised to hear how you noticed that in spite of my former prohibitions, the ecclesiastics continue to carry on some peltry trade with the Indians; my intention is that you see to preventing such, letting the ecclesiastics know that in so doing they are disobeying my orders, and that if they should continue, you would be obliged to notify me. I would then make use of my authority and apply the necessary remedy. I dare hope that you will easily abolish this custom and that henceforth, I shall hear no more complaints on that score.[15]

Frontenac then wrote telling the king the ecclesiastics *"continuent de faire quelque commerce de pelleteries avec les Sauvages."* He was careful, and with good reason, not to specify what this "commerce" consisted of, namely, the use of pelts as the only practical currency for bartering *avec les Sauvages.*[16] Neither did he say the "trade of the ecclesiastics" was carried on by some of their servants. If the ecclesiastics wanted help they had to pay much higher wages than were paid to other servants, for the very reason that these men were the servants of priests and missionaries, and as such they were forbidden to trade. A letter of M. Tronson written the same month as that of Louis XIV, explains the situation. The Sulpicians, he said, must not keep servants who are engaged in trade, but must dismiss them, especially after what the intendant had told M. Lefebvre in Montreal. There is an order of the Court forbidding trade by all those employed by clerical or civil authorities in the colony, and this is enough to prevent its toleration any longer. "It will mean an increase in expenses, and I don't know whether we shall be able to defray them for long. Meanwhile, we are sending this year all that was asked for, hoping that if Our Lord wishes us to continue this work, enough to support [the priests of Montreal] will be found for the following years."[17]

Now Parkman wrote: "The king repeatedly forbade the

---

[15] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 28, 1677, RAPQ, 1927, 89.

[16] Frontenac in his letter of November 2, 1672, to Colbert, in which he said the Jesuits were more interested in the conversion of beaver than of souls, also wrote: "les pelletries n'étant pas seulement en ce pays une marchandise, *mais encore une espèce de monnaie dont on se sert ici pour toutes sortes d'achats et de commerce,"* (italics inserted), RAPQ, 1927, 19.

[17] Tronson to Lefebvre, April 5, 1677, no. 6.

Jesuits and other ecclesiastics in Canada to carry on trade. On one occasion he threatened strong measures should they continue to disobey him."[18] A general reference to the letter quoted above is then given to support these statements. From the direct quotation the Jesuits are not specified in the letter. Nor, as far as the present writer is aware, have there been found more than two instances—and the one just quoted is the second and last instance—of that often repeated prohibition by the king. Moreover, Parkman did not see fit to mention these letters of Louis XIV were in answer to the misleading use of terms by Frontenac in a letter written to the king the preceding year, and no longer extant.

The governor's undiscoverable letter of October 29, 1676, however, was not addressed to the king but to the minister. Just as on receiving the odious ciphered accusation, so after receiving this more specific charge, Colbert did not deign to answer. The minister saw through Frontenac's game. He knew how much land the Jesuits possessed; he knew that Laval did not need the prompting of the Jesuits to launch the excommunication against the brandy sellers; and he also knew that the missionaries had more reason than Frontenac and all the French in Canada to oppose the New Englanders. They were priests, and what was worse still they were Jesuits, the foremost antagonists of the Puritans, who on their part repaid the Jesuits' antagonism with usury. Frontenac's wrath once more led him to overshoot the mark.

A few weeks after Louis XIV had written to Frontenac, Colbert, in his own letter to the governor, states that the king had ordered him to add a few lines on several points, which His Majesty had not discussed in his despatch. Here Colbert has a long paragraph about the brandy trade, but nothing about the reason which Frontenac's despatch gave for the Jesuit opposition to the traffic, and nothing about the Jesuit fur trade.[19] Colbert wrote to Duchesneau:

You can not take too many precautions to abolish altogether the habit which the ecclesiastics, secular and regular, have contracted, of trading or of having their servants trade for them. This goes directly against the orders of the king; you should let them know it, and you should prevent them from continuing this practice, using all the means at your disposal to attain this end.[20]

---

[18] *Old Régime,* 329.

[19] Colbert to Frontenac, May 18, 1677, RAPQ, 1927, 91-93.

What the servants' trade was, whether they traded for their employers or for themselves, is described above in the letter of M. Tronson. Paid the same salary as the servants of the other inhabitants of New France, they naturally wished to enjoy the same privileges as those of the other servants, that is, they wished to increase their salary by doing some trading on the side.[21] This privilege, however, was forbidden them only because their masters were ecclesiastics. Why the French government forbade these men to trade is easily deduced. Louis XIV and Colbert had written to Frontenac that if his servants traded, there could not fail to be among the people a suspicion of partiality toward these men, should contests and law suits arise. Moreover, trading was looked upon in seventeenth century France as an unworthy avocation for the first and second estates. In Paris, the Court wanted to preclude any favoritism. Servants of the clergy might be in a better position to make profits denied to servants of inhabitants because of the position and influence of their masters. Both king and ministers wanted to uphold the pontifical decrees which forbade the ecclesiastics from engaging in commercial pursuits. There was always the possibility that the ecclesiastics might use their servants as a screen for their own trading. The greedy, money-loving officers and officials, saw this not only as a possibility, but as a fact. Morbid suspicions of the clergy profiting by the trade of their servants are voiced in their letters to France and these are the proofs that the ecclesiastics and the Jesuits devoted their time and energy to commercial pursuits.

---

[20] Colbert to Duchesneau, April 20, 1677, Clément, III², 617.

[21] Father Le Mercier is clear about this in his letter to the General, August 26, 1670. "Unum est praeterea, de quo rogare Paternitatem vram patribus nostris visum est. Attendentes enim ad graves labores, et eximia officia, qua nobis ubique in missionibus praesertim praestant domestici ad vitam, *qui privati remanent ingenti lucro, quod, ipsis videntibus, consequuntur in istis regionibus remotis, similis conditionis homines externi, ita ut uno aliquando anno, mille Aureorum lucrum faciant. Putarent sensum jacturae illius mitigatum iri, alio aliquo insigni lucro spiritali;* nullum autem videri commodius quam si placuerit Paternitati vrae facere potestatem Superiori harum regionum, reddendi illos (saltem qui caeteros meritis antecellent) participes meritorum et Indulgentiarum Societatis, haec insignis gratia *acerbitatem sensus jacturae illius temporalis deliniret,* et currentibus calcar adderet ad stadium, ad finem usque fortiter et feliciter decurrent. Erit et istud singulare benevolentiae et charitatis Paternitatis vrae in hanc missionem monumentum, quod nec primum gratanter agnoscimus, nec ultimum speramus fore," ASJ, Gal., 110, I, 56. (Italics inserted.)

Colbert really did not bother much about it all; in fact, during the heated discussion with M. Dudouyt over the brandy traffic, the minister did not once mention "le commerce des ecclésiastiques." He did not retort when the vicar-general asked for a higher subsidy for the maintenance of the diocesan clergy. If the minister had put any faith in Frontenac's statements, he certainly would have argued that the profits coming to the priests would enable them to get along without further gratuities. With regard to the Jesuits, the minister believed so little in the declamations of the governor about the immense revenues from their vast land estates, and the huge profits derived from their trade that, this very year, 1677, a few months after having received Frontenac's accusing letter, he approved paying 6,000 livres to the Jesuits of Canada "à cause de leurs missions."[22]

Such action on the part of Colbert, coupled with the omission of any allusion to the accusing letter of October 29, 1676, was not wasted on Frontenac. The governor sensed the disbelief and rebuke. He prepared his "proofs." These were brought to France by none other than La Salle at the end of 1677 or at the beginning of 1678. Now did La Salle give to Colbert the packet of letters, and this one in particular containing Frontenac's proofs, and was this latter then the same as we have it today? The letter of 1677 contained a statement of the trade of the Jesuits and an account of the land concession to them near Sault St. Louis. Surely, La Salle must have delivered the letters. But then several difficulties arise. How, for instance, can Colbert's silence about the proofs be explained? He says nothing about them in his own letters of 1678 to Frontenac. Then again, if the Jesuits were trading, the minister would communicate the information to the king, as a violation of his ordinances. But the king in writing to the governor in May 1678 made no mention of the trade or proofs. Contrary to what would be expected had the Jesuits been under suspicion, the king and Colbert signed for them in May 1678 a decree of amortization granted by the king, exempting their landed estates in Canada from royal dues.[23] After getting the replies, Frontenac wrote another letter, the one of 1679, not carried by La Salle, in which mention is again made of the concession and his reasons for not granting it. The reaction of the king to this was immediate and final; he informed Frontenac in effect, that the grant to the Jesuits has been made. All of which, namely, the absence of allusions to any Jesuit trading as "proved" by Frontenac in his letter of 1677, and the positive favorable grants to the accused, seems to indicate that the king did not get the letter carried by La Salle, or, if he did, it was not the same as what we have today.

---

[22] AC, B 7:91.

One instance of the Jesuits at trade may be selected from these proofs. Father Dablon had asked Frontenac in 1674 for the Sault St. Louis concession. Frontenac had put him off until the summer. The governor was averse to make this land grant because, as he wrote to Colbert, "Their [Jesuits] real reason is, I think, that they do not want to have neighbors who can observe them at close quarters." Another reason, the governor alleged, was: "They already have innumerable concessions in this country, and that which they are asking for would better accommodate good settlers which large families who are asking me for it."[24] No more is heard about this in the governor's letters until the date of the memoir, to be analyzed presently. He had refused the land grant to the Jesuits until now—he wrote in 1677—because he had promised it not to fathers of large family, but to the Sieur de la Salle. Yet in spite of such promise on his part, and even on the part of the intendant, M. Duchesneau had made over the land to the Jesuits; but as long as the governor did not sign it, the deed was invalid. Again in 1679, he wrote to the king that three years hence, the Indians of the Prairie de la Madeleine had migrated and had gone to settle "on the land which they [Jesuits] obtained from M. Duchesneau, when he arrived in this country. However, I did not think I should give them the title until I knew Your Majesty's intentions, for the reason which I had the honor to give two years ago," that is, in 1677.[25] His Majesty returned a swift and sharp answer; he had granted the Jesuits the "concession they asked me of the place called the Sault [St. Louis] adjoining the Prairie de la Madeleine for the establishment of the Iroquois."[26]

---

[23] Amortissement pour les jesuites de Canada, May 12, 1678, AC, B 7:175v-179; *Edits,* I, 102; cf. *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 337.

[24] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, RAPQ, 1927, 78.

We return to the letter brought by La Salle to Colbert. Most likely the king knew nothing of it. Did Colbert receive it? This is very doubtful. It is not found in the Archives of the Colonies where it would have been deposited, but among Bernou's papers, and certainly it was not in the official French Archives in 1687. In this year, the French to establish a claim prior to that of the English in North America, had a memoir composed on the explorations of Frenchmen in the West. Extracts from letters of Talon, of Frontenac, and of the king were used to prove the better claim of the French.[27] Yet no allusion is made in this memoir to Frontenac's letter of 1677. The force of this argument is patent when one recalls that the letter, over and above the accusations of trade, contained a significant passage, an assertion that La Salle had traveled before Jolliet, although it does not state in what part of America. Again, if Colbert received the proofs brought to France by La Salle, the minister's silence about the trade of the Jesuits is still more puzzling. Did he see the letter and judge the proofs inane? And what, if he saw the assertion, did he think of La Salle's trip, prior to Jolliet?

But whether the proofs were handed to Colbert or not, they will now be set forth and discussed. The "piquantes accusations" of Frontenac, as Parkman wrote to Margry,[28] are contained in a memoir which was written in Paris in 1678. The present writer noted its certain peculiarities elsewhere,[29] but at the time had not seen the memoir except as printed by Margry.[30] Margry's antecedents should have put him on guard against unverified assertions; instead he rashly assumed that for once the compiler could be trusted. There was disillusionment when a photostat of the document came from Paris,[31] for obviously Margry once more had led astray everyone who used the text he published. Margry's critical annotations as to the external appearance of the documents were erroneous; the text had been tampered with; it had been carelessly edited; some unintelligible passages were caused by omissions, and the printed text was sprinkled with blunders.[32]

---

[25] Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 6, 1679, *ibid.,* 110.

[26] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 29, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 115.

[27] Memoire sur la domination des françois en Canada jusqu'en 1687, AC, C 11A, 9:260-286.

A first indication that one was in presence of another example of rigging by Margry was the note found in Leland, who says the document was a "draft in the hand of Bernou."[33] Margry, however, asserted in a note that "the text on which this copy [which he printed] was made, is *en minute,* the first, rough draft."[34] A first draft of a letter of Frontenac to Colbert by Bernou in 1677 appeared strange. The abbé was then in France, and Frontenac in Canada. There was no reason to doubt Leland; he knew the handwriting of Bernou; he or his staff had examined and analyzed hundreds of pages of the abbé's autograph letters and papers, and the document in question is found among Bernou's papers. Hence Margry's assertions were to be controlled. On the second page of the printed version, the editor, Margry, tells us that the document has a marginal note "in the hand of Frontenac." Margry made other critical remarks, such as: a passage concerning the *Hospitalières* of Quebec is crossed out; there was *moy* changed to M. de Frontenac; several paragraphs are cancelled.[35]

---

[28] Parkman to Margry, August 9, 1876, in *Smith College Studies in History,* VIII, 1923, 169.

[29] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 58-60.

[30] Margry, I, 301-325.

[31] BN, Clairambault, 1016:43-48v.

[32] Compare, for instance, Margry, I, 304-305, where Laval's yearly income is given, with the text in BN, Clairambault, 1016:44. The passage in the manuscript is full of erasures and changes; the memorialist, Bernou, manipulated what he knew about the revenues of Laval until by clever juggling it reached the total of 25,000 livres a year. A decade later, Bernou was still busy showing how wealthy the Bishop of Quebec was, cf. Bernou to Renaudot, February 10, 1685, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:198-198v. See also Margry, I, 313, where the misreading of the text turns a layman into a person able to absolve a penitent. The *Sieur* Martial spoken of by Margry is in the text the P[ère] Martial [Limozin], a Recollect, etc., etc.

[33] Leland, *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris,* Washington, D. C., 1932, 172. Leland entered the document as follows: [Frontenac to Colbert] (Draft in the hand of Abbé Bernou). Ptd. Margry, I, 301-325. In her *Calendar,* issued a few years before Leland's *Guide,* Mrs. Surrey listed the document as: [1677?] Bernou to Colbert. Opposition of the Canadian Clergy to La Salle. (Draft.) 12 pp. BN. MSS. Clair. 1016. Margry, I, 301.

[34] Margry, I, 301, note.

Only a few words need be said with regard to these various statements. The document is not *en minute,* it is a copy by Bernou of a letter of Frontenac; the verbal and stylistic changes are the abbé's who was a much better writer than Frontenac or his secretaries. The marginal note is not in the hand of Frontenac. The whole document is in the handwriting of Bernou, marginal notes, of which there are many, as well as text. The passage about the *Hospitalières* is not crossed out; Bernou left the place blank; but the two lines about the riches of the Ursulines were cancelled by the abbé. Not only are the three paragraphs spoken of by Margry cancelled, but nine paragraphs are bodily struck out; and M. de Frontenac takes the place of *moy* many times, especially in the first pages of the document.

The outward appearance of the document reveals its nature.[36] It is a draft of a memoir by Bernou to be presented to Colbert, based on a letter of Frontenac and filled in with extracts from memoirs brought in by La Salle. The changes made by Bernou consist mainly in modifying some of the crude statements of Frontenac, in inserting, besides the enclosures, reflexions on what he knew about the affairs of Canada, which at that time was not very much.[37] For unascertainable reasons, Bernou did not "adapt" the whole letter. Toward the end of his copy, he no longer changed the first personal pronoun into M. de Frontenac. The manuscript also reveals that Bernou was composing two memoirs out of the letter of Frontenac, as is evidenced by some marginal notes indicating that paragraphs crossed out in the copy of the letter were to be used in the "other memoir."[38] If Bernou ever made a neat copy of his work, it has not come down to us.

---

[35] Margry, I, 302, 307-308, 309.

[36] On a previous occasion, *Some La Salle Journeys,* 60, I made use of the memoir under scrutiny and attributed authorship to Frontenac because I rashly followed Margry. I supposed that Bernou had made a transcription, more or less faithful of the original Frontenac letter. After careful study of a photograph of the document, my conclusion is, that Frontenac wrote a letter in 1677. This fell into the hands of Bernou, who wrote, or at least intended to produce two memoirs from its contents. What Frontenac composed has disappeared; what Bernou wrote remains. Now, in the passage of *Some La Salle Journeys* mentioned above, I wrote: "The only copy extant is in the handwriting of Bernou, and it is this draft which Margry printed." I used the word "copy" not thinking at the time that there was am-

It is not difficult to reconstruct what took place. La Salle arrived in Paris and cast his lot with the Renaudot group, to whom Bernou belonged. The letter was certainly shown to his new friends, otherwise we cannot explain how Bernou was able to copy it. But the abbé realized that as it was it would not have the effect desired. What Frontenac needed was a re-write man, and he could hardly have found a better one than Bernou. A question naturally arises to which no certain answer can be given. Did Bernou dissuade La Salle from handing over the "proofs" and the letter of Colbert? As was noted above, none of these documents are found in the official archives. Little is achieved by saying Frontenac's correspondence for the years 1675-1678 is not found in the archives either, for the answers of Colbert and of Louis XIV for these years are extant, and neither makes the slightest allusion of these "proofs." On the other hand, it is unlikely that La Salle would have dared not to hand these letters to the minister. He had a clear interest in let-

---

biguity, for some might suppose I was using "copy" in contradistinction to "original." Certainly, as far as Bernou is concerned, it is original, but rewritten and rearranged from Frontenac's letter. A reviewer, in *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* XXV, 1938, 386, says that Bernou wrote the letter for Frontenac, but on what grounds the statement is made is not clear.

[37] Cf. Bernou to Renaudot, February 1, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:98.

[38] Cf. Clairambault, 1016:45v.

ting Colbert know what the Jesuits were doing in Canada, how they allegedly traded and sought to ruin his seigniory of Fort Frontenac. Whichever solution is adopted, the history of this letter remains puzzling.

Before analyzing the contents of this document as it is found in the archives, in contradistinction to its printed form, it may be asked why Margry published it, and why he published it as he did. An answer to the first question is given in the initial footnote:

> The sentiment of impartiality which led us to publish the extremely eulogistic notice about Father Claude Allouez and certain instructions mixed with reproaches of Colbert to Frontenac, did not allow us to reject a document which contains very important assertions relative to Cavelier de la Salle and Jolliet. Forced to deal with a period replete with prejudices and clashing interests in the midst of which the Mississippi River was discovered, the editor of this compilation must not have and sincerely has no other aim than to furnish without comments testimonies to history. It is for history to examine and to pass judgment.[39]

This is a good sample of Margry's cant.[40] There was no objection to printing this document, if only the editor had warned the student of its peculiar external appearance, and had not led people astray with his notes. The main reason for publication is said to be the important assertions about La Salle and Jolliet. What these assertions are has been discussed elsewhere.[41] A corrected passage of this memoir was given as one of the four proofs that La Salle discovered the Mississippi before Jolliet,[42] but Margry took good care not to call the reader's attention to the correction or peculiarity. At a loss for arguments, Margry used this amended text as his third proof, but did not allow anybody to see the document itself. He handed out either his own copies of the original or transcripts of these copies made by a scribe. Another reason for publishing the document, but not stated, may have been the indictment it contained of the clergy of Canada, the bishop, the diocesan clergy, the Sulpicians, and the Jesuits. This study is only concerned with the contents insofar as the Jesuits are mentioned. Attention will be called to what is clearly Frontenac's and what is Bernou's own contribution.

---

[39] Margry, I, 301, note.

[40] See another example in *ibid.,* I, Introduction, xxvi, where he asserts that for the sake of truth he is ready to sacrifice "ses intérêts et son repos," come what may.

[41] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 58-60.

[42] The "important passage" reads thus: "le 1^{er} desquels [Jolliet] ils ont tant vante par avance quoiquil nait voyage quapres le S^r de la Salle lequel mesme vous temoignera que *ledt Jolliet a menty*"; Bernou deleted the words in italics, and inserted between the lines: "la relation du S^r Jolliet est fausse en beaucoup de choses," BN, Clairambault, 1016:48v.

Judging from the summary of Frontenac's letter of October 29, 1676, given by Rochemonteix, the parts of the document which are clearly the governor's do not greatly differ from that letter. The opening paragraphs, which Bernou filled with erasures and verbal changes and which he finally crossed out altogether, are a prelude to the broadside. The wrath of the governor after the ordinance of 1676, is only too evident. He roundly accuses all the clergy of Canada with the exception of the Recollects, of tyranny, ambition, and greed. First their riches are discussed. The sources of their wealth are enumerated—gratuities from the king, alms from their supporters in France, revenues from the most fertile and most advantageously located land in Canada; and "finally the trade which they continue to carry on in spite of the orders which the king was obliged to send them to make them desist."[43] To show that these general statements were not invented, the author descends to particulars. Here in Bernou's manuscript, the transcription of Frontenac's letter suddenly breaks off, and the abbé gives a list of the documentary proofs of the trade of the Jesuits, those likely brought to France by La Salle. Here for the first time the missionaries are specifically named. In Frontenac's letter these enclosures were "cotté A," but, they are no longer to be found, and Bernou did not copy, but merely summarized their contents. The Jesuits are named a second time, when the governor enumerated their land property in New France, and a third time toward the end of the letter, where their trade is again dealt with.

There is little to be said about the land concessions.

---

[43] BN, Clairambault, 1016:44v; Margry, I, 302.

Frontenac enumerated the acreage possessed by the "ecclesiastics" in Canada. Where he speaks of the Jesuits, his statements are too vague to be checked on the official list of the various land grants owned by the Jesuits in New France, a list made at the very time when Bernou wrote this memoir. This is certain, the governor wished to impress upon the minister that the missionaries possessed numerous and immense tracts of land in Canada.

The third time the Jesuits are censured, the governor repeats what he had written before respecting the frenchification of the natives, the brandy traffic with the Indians, and the trade in which the Jesuits were supposed to be engaged. The tirade, it is true, is against "les ecclésiastiques" but here it is clear who these are. Frontenac complains because the Indians do not speak French; he criticizes the "ecclesiastics," that is, the Jesuits, for being opposed to the amalgamation of French and Indians, although both of these means "are the only way to make true Christians of the Indians. Consequently, in spite of their mission, there are hardly any true Christians among the Indians. My Lord can learn this from several persons who are now in France." As long as the Indians live among themselves, Frontenac asserts, they will abandon the Christian religion, their lawful wives, their huts, and the missionaries at the first caprice.

> But these gentlemen [the Jesuits] have been constantly opposing [the frenchification and amalgamation schemes]. Owing to the ignorance of our language and of our manners in which they keep the Indians, they make them believe anything they please. It is the reason why one of them maltreated and removed the little Iroquois girl I supported at the convent of the Ursulines; and it is the reason why they found it amiss that M. de la Salle has more than fifty [Indian] children taught [French] at Fort Frontenac, several of whom already begin to know how to read and write; it is the reason why they made the Iroquois of the Prairie de la Madeleine move away, because the Indians were too close to the French settlements for their liking. And after they have obtained so many land grants, they have had M. Duchesneau grant them, in his own name, against the king's orders, the Sault St. Louis concession, which he and I had promised to the Sieur de la Salle.

To obtain these concessions they proceed in a clever manner. They ask the land for the Indians; they have these clear the land and rent it to the French, so that there is not one Indian who owns as much as one foot of land.

> But whatever they may do, the Indians themselves begin to see through some of their ruses. One of them, called Marie Félix, an exceedingly clever girl who speaks French as if she were born in Paris, told me several times that the Indians are very much dissatisfied with the missionaries; that they begin to know that the land which the Fathers made them clear belongs to them, (that they are treated as slaves; that they are forced to buy all they need from one Hazeur, apparently one of their agents);[44] that they were prevented from coming to my help at the time of the fire, the Father telling them that God was punishing me for my sins; that [the Fathers] are constantly disparaging me, and many other things of the same sort.
>
> An [Iroquois] dictionary they made fell into the hands of Father Louis [Hennepin].[45] It shows the idea they give of themselves to the Indians. Explaining for instance the word *equal,* they put down: "The Black Robe is equal to Onontio." They told other Indians that they are the masters, and that Onontio or the governor carries the sword. They have also said more than once that everything would go wrong until the ecclesiastics control the whole government.

In truth, they are nearly the masters of the whole colony. Their concessions are located at the two entrances of it; they hold the two keys to the country, at the mouth of the St. Lawrence and at Montreal. In this passage, Frontenac does not speak specifically of the Jesuits, but he soon returned to his *bête noire.*

> They have also founded an establishment at Michilimackinac, an

---

[44] The words in parenthesis are marginal additions, BN, Clairambault, 1016:47v.

[45] Hennepin went to the Iroquois country during the absence of La Salle. "We stay'd some time among these People, lodging with a *Jesuite* that has been born at Lions, to transcribe an *Iroquese* Dictionary." *New Discovery,* II, 42. The Jesuit was Father Bruyas, the missionary among the Mohawks and then Superior of all the Iroquois missions. The sentence Frontenac objected to is not found in the *Radices verborum Iroquaeorum,* of Father Bruyas, published by Shea in 1862. Father Bruyas is also credited with having composed a *Vocabulaire François-Agnier,* which the present writer was unable to consult.

island by which one must necessarily pass to go to the Lake of the Illinois [Michigan], and they have built a fort which shuts up Lake Superior or Tracy at Sault Ste. Marie. In the latter place, they have cannons, and here took place the massacre of the Sioux ambassadors. The last survivor of these ambassadors, having locked himself in the chapel, was killed with a cannon shot by a missionary brother, whose name is known to the whole colony. So that they will soon be the master of all the avenues, far and near.

Not only are they engaged in trade, against the ordinances of the king and in spite of the suppression of the *congés,* but they have an understanding with the English, whom they praise, (at whose councils they sit).[46] They entice the French to trade with the English, and they have made several trips to Albany and to New York, as is proved by their letters enclosed herein. They even went so far as to ask the leave of Major Andros, Governor of New York or New Netherland, to remain in the Iroquois country, which incontestably belongs to the king [of France]. This is not a made up accusation, for there is [*l'on a*] a letter of Major Andros which proves the last point.

Last year, 1676, they set a trap for the governor on the occasion of the Iroquois war, then threatening the colony. But a trip to Cataracouy foiled their attempts, which had no other purpose than to ruin M. de la Salle.

They formerly called him [La Salle] a visionary. Now that by expenses, cares, and extraordinary hardships, he successfully carried out his plan, and has even done more than could be expected and more than he promised, even going so far as to force the Iroquois to build his fort and to till his own land, which nobody had succeeded in doing before him, for it was thought impossible; he has become the object of their envy and of their aversion; all the more since his establishment [Fort Frontenac] impedes their trade with the English, and is an obstacle to the communications they would like to have with those among them who are in the Ottawa country.

The reason for these maneuvers is then given. They learned that La Salle had the intention of asking for the trade monopoly of Lakes Erie and Michigan; they asked for this concession on behalf of Jolliet and Bazire, two men completely in their devotion. They also want to restore the *congés* and put them in the hands of Sieur Bazire or in those of a dozen private individuals; if they succeed in this

---

[46] The words in parentheses are in the margin, BN, Clairambault, 1016:48.

> there is no hope left to prevent not only their trade, but even to prevent them from having in their hand most of the commerce of the colony. I learned that they also intend to found a share-holding society for selling brandy, after having cried so much to have the liquor traffic prohibited. But I have no misgivings on this score, because I know that your ability will easily see what would be its inconveniences and consequences. It remains, my Lord, to beg of you to note how great and widespread are the disorders caused by the ecclesiastics in the colony. Note that I bring proofs for all the main accusations; that I say nothing about myself, although I have had to suffer more than any one else. I avoided all mention of myself, lest I be accused of pleading my own cause and not that of the whole country, and that to spare their reputation, with the exception of the bishop, I have not given the name of even one of them, although I know their names well. M. de la Salle will give the names to you, if you order him.[47]

Before considering the particular counts of this long indictment, a few remarks must be made about the quotations just given. They were certainly in the letter of Frontenac. Only a few complementary marginal additions are by Bernou. Two passages are especially noteworthy. In one the Jesuits are accused of being traitors to France, of hobnobbing with the English and the Dutch, with enclosures in proof. In the second, occurs the statement that to spare the reputation of the "ecclesiastics, no names are given, except that of the bishop." This latter statement of Frontenac seemed strange to the writer, since the pages preceding teemed with names. The document was lacking and there was only Margry's garbled text to go by. But it ceases to be strange once the memoir is at hand. Frontenac did not mention any name in his letter, but names were mentioned in the enclosures, and La Salle filled in the other blanks. Bernou embodied all in the memoir which, as adapted, was to be presented to Colbert. The first of Bernou's insertions deals precisely with all the specific accusations concerning the trading activities of the Jesuits.

---

[47] BN, Clairambault, 1016:47v-48v, Margry, I, 319-325.

Having transcribed the paragraph of the letter of Frontenac in which the governor speaks of the revenues of the "ecclesiastics," of the manner in which they enrich themselves by various means and above all by their trade, to prove these were no inventions, Bernou inserted

> There is the written avowal of one of them, *cotté A,* wherein he contends that the fur trade they carry on in two places located very near each other, only brings 4,000 livres profit per annum, instead of 20,000 livres as rumor had it.
>
> [There is] the declaration of an Indian squaw named Marie Félix, (who speaks French and who told M. de Frontenac)[48] that Father Chaumonot forbade the Indians whom he instructs at Lorette[49] to buy their needs from the merchants, having promised them to have all kinds of merchandises in their warehouse.
>
> That [declaration] of Sieur Denison, at present in Paris, who met two overloaded canoes belonging to the missionaries containing among other things three *Rooles* of tobacco, which is the merchandise bringing the greatest profit.
>
> That [declaration] of the man called Allain [stating] that five canoes belonging to Indians of the Prairie de la Madeleine loaded with beaver,[50] as much as they could carry, having met Socoqui Indians, their enemies,[51] sent to the missionary of the Prairie de la Madeleine to ask whether they should proceed.
>
> The letter[52] which Father Bruyas wrote to the Sieur D'Allerais inviting him to trade with New York.
>
> The letter which Father de Lamberville wrote to the Sieur de la Salle was brought by an Indian; by it he made known to him[53] of a means of sending beaver pelts to New Netherland.
>
> The buying by the missionaries in the Ottawa country of the merchandises belonging to the French who have been recalled thence in compliance with the orders of His Majesty,

---

[48] The words in parentheses were added by Bernou, who took them from what is said further down in the letter of Frontenac.

[49] Margry, I, 303, transcribed the words *a lorrette* as *a l'ordinaire.*

[50] The manuscript shows that Bernou was summarizing or was copying a summary. He began to write *a morte* [*-charge*] as in the preceding paragraph. He crossed out the words *a morte,* inserted *de castor* on the top and continued *autant qu'ils en pouuoient porter.*

[51] *Leurs ennemis* is an interlinear addition.

[52] Bernou had written *Les lettres* first.

[53] "Par lequel il luy *conse* [*illait*] presentoit un moyen." The abbé began to write the word in italics, then crossed it out.

And several other proofs which will be furnished if my Lord wishes.[54]

The frenchification scheme and the brandy trade with the Indians have been discussed at length in preceding pages, and since there is nothing new in what is said by Frontenac, it is useless to delay on these two items.[55] But there are two specific instances which deserve more than a passing mention: the great success of La Salle at Fort Frontenac with regard to the frenchification, and the migration of the Indians from the Prairie de la Madeleine to Sault St. Louis, four miles away. The great success of La Salle's colonization, as distinguished from what Fort Frontenac was and remained, will be seen below. But the "éducation toute française," the successful frenchification at Fort Frontenac is purely imaginary. Nowhere else is there found a reference to this great success. Le Clercq blandly asserted that Fort Frontenac was the means to draw the natives to the Jesuit sedentary missions near Montreal and Quebec. As a matter of truth, the Iroquois were coming to settle at the Prairie long before Fort Frontenac was even thought of. And, as will be shown, the seignior of Fort Frontenac and the governor did their best to wreck the mission of La Prairie. Le Clercq, after having delivered himself of his statement, continued:

---

[54] Bernou had written "et plusieurs autres faicts," he deleted *faicts,* and wrote *preuves* instead. He continued "qu'on obmet pour n'estre pas," again deleted these words and replaced them with "fournira si Monseigneur le souhaitte," BN, Clairambault, 1016:43v, Margry, I, 303.

[55] The memoir contains an astonishing passage about the ordinance of 1668 allowing freedom of the brandy trade in New France. The text is given as in Margry, I, 312-313, with the cancellations made by Bernou in italics, BN, Clairambault, 1016:46. It is unnecessary to add that the deletions are not indicated by Margry. "Mais ce qui a fait le plus d'esclat et à quoy ils s'opiniastrent le plus, par des raisons d'intérest *déduites dans un autre mémoire,* c'est le cas réservé pour la défense de l'eau-de-vie avec les Sauvages. Le Conseil souverain en a permis la traite par son arrest du 10 Novembre 1668, *par l'avis mesme des Révérends Pères Jésuistes, comme il y est énoncé*; mais, malgré cet arrest et sans attendre la reponse de la Cour sur ce sujet, ils ont interdit le nommé Roland pour cela seul *sujet* avec des circonstances violentes et odieuses au dernier point." It is almost unbelievable that Frontenac should have written what was so patently false. He had seen the registers of the Sovereign Council; the king was soon to write that he had absolutely no right to keep the registers in his house, Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 29, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 114. He knew that the advice of the Jesuits was not asked on this occasion, cf. *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 534, and he knew that the Jesuits never had and never would counsel such a measure. Bernou had not seen the registers, but as he was not so foolish as to let the statement stand, he hastened to cross out the blunder. The "avis des Révérends Pères Jésuites" was asked September 28, 1663, that is fifteen years previously, when the Council was deliberating on the decree which *forbade* any one to trade or give, directly or indirectly, under any pretext whatever, intoxicating drinks to the Indians, under penalty for the first offense of 300 livres fine, and for the second offense lashes or banishment, *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 38.

> An Iroquois village gathered, too, near the fort, to which Fathers Louis Hennepin and Luke Buisset were appointed. The former made excursions to the Iroquois nations, drew families from them to the fort, and having perfected himself in their language and the means of gaining them to God, labored there several years with fruit. Father Luke Buisset, a religious of singular merit, profound erudition, and great regularity of life, followed the Indians everywhere, and even twice wintered with them in the woods in order to gain them to Christ.[56]

What is in Leclercq is nothing else than a paraphrase of what is found in the *Description of Louisiana,* with one noticeable change—in the *Description* the Indians learn French, while in the *First Establishment* it is the Recollects who perfect themselves in the Iroquois language. There is reason to believe, Hennepin wrote in 1682, a considerable colony will be formed at Fort Frontenac, for when he left there were already thirteen or fourteen families and a

> mission house which I built with our dear Recollect Father, Luke Buisset, with the help of Sieur de la Salle, whereby, we attracted a pretty large [assez considérable] village of Iroquois, whose children we teach to read with our little French children, and they teach each other their language in turn. This maintains a good understanding with the Iroquois, who clear the land in order to plant Indian corn so as to subsist all the year except the hunting season.[57]

In the summer of 1679, Hennepin tells us he returned to Fort Frontenac, and while waiting for a favorable wind

---

[56] Le Clercq, II, 87.

[57] *A Description of Louisiana,* Shea's translation, New York, 1880, 59.

> We made frequent [plusieurs, *i. e.,* several] Visits to the Savages, whom we had persuaded to settle themselves near the Fort, who, together with their Children, whom we had taught to read and write, lamented our Departure.[58]

When these texts are juxtaposed to other texts taken from the *New Discovery* and the *New Voyage,* a very peculiar picture of the state of affairs at Fort Frontenac is the result, and the complete French education of the Indian children seems hardly to have been begun. During the two years and a half Hennepin spent there, "they cultivated more than a hundred Acres of land." We do not know who "they" [on] are, whether Indians, or French, or both. Elsewhere Hennepin says "they" are the Indians, and so says the memoir of 1678. But as will be seen in a moment, the Indians spent very little time at the Fort. When Hennepin departed to undertake his "great Voyage," in November 1678, instead of the thirteen or fourteen families of the *Description,* he "left there about fifteen or sixteen families together,"[59] that is, French families, husbands with their wives and children. Now, one year before the great voyage began, September 7, 1677, the official census of Fort Frontenac gives four settlers [*habitants*], only two of whom were married, and they had seven children in all.[60]

In the winter of 1676-1677, Hennepin went with La Salle to an *"Iroquese* Village call'd *Ganneousse,* near to *Kenté,* about nine leagues from the Fort." He made a speech to the Indians that determined a considerable number of natives to come to Cataracouy,

> in order to form a little village of about forty cottages to be inhabited by them, lying betwixt the Fort and our House of Mission. . . . We had the Apostolick Creed, the Lord's prayer, and our ordinary prayers, translated into the Iroquese language, which we caus'd them to get by heart, and repeat to their chil-

---

[58] *New Discovery,* I, 99-100. The French text reads as follows: "Leurs enfants, a qui nous avions donné quelque teinture des lettres pour apprendre à lire et à ecrire, nous temoignoient le deplaisir que leurs parens & eux avoient de nous voir partir," *Nouvelle decouverte d'un tres grand Pays,* . . . Utrecht, 1697, 109. The English 1698 *Tonson* edition which Thwaites reprinted often renders the French original inadequately.

[59] *New Discovery,* I, 47.

[60] Margry, I, 298.

> dren; and . . . obliging them to frequent converse with the Children of Europeans that inhabited the Fort; so that they mutually taught one another their Mother-Languages; which serves likewise to entertain a good Correspondence with the Iroquese.[61]

The "cottages" are the French *cabannes*. It is usual to count more than two families to the "cottage," and forty would give between 80 and 100 families; elsewhere, Hennepin speaks of 50 families. The papooses of these families must have far outnumbered the seven French children of the two families then at the Fort; and even if we had no contradictory statement by Hennepin himself, it is easy to imagine what language was spoken, who taught whom, and what manner of "éducation toute française" was being imparted at Fort Frontenac. Even if the papooses had learned a few words of French, they forgot them from one year to another. In winter, the Indians went hunting for "five or six Months," taking their families with them "so that their children being absent all the season of Hunting, forgot what we had instill'd into them at Fort Frontenac."[62]

In the *New Voyage*, Hennepin delivered himself of his views on the evangelization of the Indians. One of the obstacles to their conversion, he wrote, is that they have no fixed place. "While I was at Fort Frontenac, Father Luke Buisset and myself, were employed a great part of the Year to teach many [plusieurs, *i. e.*, several] Children our ordinary Prayers, and (even) to read in their own Iroquois language." The parents of these children assisted at the service in the chapel of the fort; they seemed to be moved by what they saw, but, adds Hennepin, this was only in order to please the missionaries and in the hope of getting some present.

> But in case they had had some laudable Design, they would quickly have renounced it, because they stay no longer in their Villages than till Harvest be over (que pendant qu'il faut semer

---

[61] *New Discovery,* I, 48. "Nous les rendions familiers avec les enfans des nos habitans Européens du Fort. Ces enfans, qui nous estoient chers, parce qu'ils etoient nez Chretiens, conversans ainsi avec ces petits Iroquois, ils s'entr'apprenoient leurs langues maternelles," *Nouvelle decouverte,* 36-37.

[62] *New Discovery,* I, 49.

ou recueillir le blé d'Inde), which is but a small time: All the rest of the Year they pass in Wars and Hunting. Then they carry their Families with them, and are absent eight or nine Months: Their children then, which have begun to learn something, forget all (ce qu'on leur avoit enseigné), and fall to their former Superstitions and methods of living.[63]

It seems that one is entitled to draw the conclusion that, if during the eight or nine months the Indian children spend in the woods, or even during the five or six months Hennepin had given previously, they forgot the rudiments of religion taught them in their mother tongue, they certainly forgot whatever French they had learned. Contrary to Le Clercq's assertion, Hennepin says "it was impossible for any Missionary to follow the Indians into these wild Desarts,"[64] when they went hunting. During one winter, while he remained at the Fort, he instructed a few Indians, but in vain, for after all his work, "these miserable dark Creatures (ces pauvres aveugles spirituels) . . . gave no better sign of Edification, than others in our Articles of Faith . . . and the Children follow'd the unhappy Example of their Parents, insomuch that 'twas no better than a plain profanation of Baptism to administer it to them."[65]

We are then far from the progress spoken of in the letter of Frontenac of 1677, according to whom there were fifty Indian children, who, that year, had already begun to read and write French. Something very peculiar stands forth in these various accounts of the schooling at Fort Frontenac, but another peculiarity is found when we compare them with the document under present analysis. In 1678, Bernou "adapted" the letter of Frontenac. In it, La

---

[63] *Ibid.*, II, 542, *Nouveau Voyage d'un Pais plus grand que l'Europe . . .*, Utrecht, 1698, 257.

[64] *New Discovery*, I, 48.

[65] *Ibid.*, II, 460-461. "The Recollects brand the Savages for stupid, gross and rustick Persons, uncapable of Thought or Reflection: But the Jesuits give them other sort of Language, for they intitle them to good Sense, to a tenacious Memory, and to a quick Apprehension season'd with a solid Judgment. The former allege that 'tis to no purpose to preach the Gospel to a sort of People that have less Knowledge than the Brutes. On the other hand the latter (I mean the Jesuits) give it out, that these Savages take Pleasure in hearing the Word of God, and readily apprehend the meaning of the Scriptures," Lahontan, *New Voyages*, II, 413.

Salle was reputedly educating the Indian children in reading and writing French, yet in 1682, when Bernou "adapted" Hennepin's book to write the so-called "Relation des descouvertes," he left out precisely what pertains to the teaching of French to the papooses—just as the editor of Leclercq was to do a few years later—and he cut the Recollect's text where the direct quotation from the *Description* given above begins.[66] Had Bernou become aware in the interval that he had to take with many grains of salt what he had learned about the "éducation toute française" from Frontenac and from La Salle?[67]

To return to the memoir of 1678. It is safe to assume that no instance of Jesuit trade was left out, notwithstanding Bernou's offer to supply several other "proofs" on request. This assumption is warranted, since the purpose of Frontenac's letter was precisely to damnify the Jesuits on the trade question.

The first specific proof listed is found in a letter of "one of them," stating how much profit from the beaver trade the Jesuits made in a year in two places not far distant from each other. "One of them" was Father Frémin, then Superior of the Prairie de la Madeleine mission. This accusation will again appear in a "curious monument," to be analyzed later. Another remark may not be out of place at this point. It was usual for these gentlemen to speak of letters as of original documents allegedly proving their lucubrations. Thus in the "curious monument" just alluded to, the same will appear and Father Louis was to follow suit a few years later. What is remarkable is that no traces of such letters are ever found; after having been seen by the memorialists, they seem to vanish completely.

In the present case, it is regrettable that Bernou did not transcribe this letter, *if it was really one of the enclosures.* Erasures in Bernou's manuscript cause doubt to arise. To show that the accusations are not invented, *on a l'adveu* was the last version set down by the abbé. He had written something else, but it is so thoroughly erased as to be no longer legible. He then wrote on the top of the cancelled words, *et on vous fera voir Monsgr.,* which is also scratched, and replaced by a final vague, indetermined *on a.*[68] Bernou was not as imprudent as were his confederates.

---

[66] See Margry, I, 438.

[67] Cf. Bernou to Renaudot, November 4, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:169.

The probable contents of the letter can be surmised from the following sketch of the Prairie de la Madeleine mission. It is mentioned several times in Frontenac's letters. The mission, later moved to Sault St. Louis, a few miles from its original site, was a bugbear to the governor. The Superior of this Mission, Father Frémin, was guilty of two unforgiveable somethings: first, the Iroquois preferred to settle at the Jesuit mission rather than at Frontenac's trading post, Cataracouy; secondly, Father Frémin had prevented the protégés of the governor from opening a saloon in the mission.

The mission founded in 1667, by Father Raffeix, had very humble beginnings. The Indians, mostly Iroquois, were at first living with the French; they were not numerous enough to become an organized mission until 1671.[69] All Indians were welcome, but those who came and wanted to stay had to forswear plurality of wives and brandy. Heathen Iroquois heard about this "reduction"; they came out of curiosity and settled there. As the Indians began to grow in number, the usual trouble arose. The French living in the village tempted the natives with brandy. This happened in 1672. Frontenac, anxious to build Cataracouy, had been helped, in 1673, by Father Frémin, who supplied the governor with flour for his workmen at Fort Frontenac. Out of gratitude he issued an ordinance expressly forbidding the sale of brandy at La Prairie.

Until now, the converted Indians were still leaving the village during the winter, and on meeting their fellow Iroquois in the woods during the hunting season, enticed them to come and settle at the mission. Two hundred persons were added in a few years. The French at or near the settlement were delighted;[70] they had at hand many Indians to whom brandy could be sold, and knowing the ill-will of M. de Frontenac whose feelings had changed since last year, they introduced drink by stealth in the village. One of them bolder than the rest opened a saloon in the village itself. But the skill, the firmness and the zeal of Father Frémin put a stop to this unfortunate trade and he saved his flock from being drowned in the waters of the Red Sea about to swallow it. It was on this occasion that the Captains [of the Indians] showed their mettle to those to whom drunkenness was their God by combatting the vice which they had forsaken when they left their country.[71]

---

[68] BN, Clairambault, 1016:43v.
[69] Cf. *Relations inédites,* I, 180.
[70] *Ibid.,* 282.

The location of the mission was bad, its land too damp, and unproductive.[72] Difficulties having arisen, some Hurons determined to go to Montreal and to ask the Sulpicians for some land. As mentioned before, they requested Frontenac to prevent the sale of brandy to them. But the governor was not going to repeat the "mistake" he had made in 1673. He answered the Huron chief, who was pleading with him, that it was incumbent upon the Indians themselves to resist the irresistible attraction brandy had for them.

The poverty of the Indians and the poor land, had led Father Dablon to ask of Frontenac the concession of the Sault, where the land was better. As has been explained, the governor for years refused to sign the deed. However, since the land requested was not settled, the Indians moved; but Frontenac continued to refuse legalizing the land grant, and with reason apparent: Indians who did not drink, who did not buy brandy from the associates of the governor, who attracted to their settlement many of their fellow-tribesmen, who in turn would no longer drink, and who would not pay a high price for the wares sold at Cataracouy by La Salle, such Indians were useless to Frontenac.

---

[71] Rochemonteix, III, 655. The foregoing and following details are taken from a manuscript preserved in the Archives Départementales de la Gironde, Bordeaux, entitled: "La fondation et l'établissement de la mission du Sault, au Canada, en 1667, dans le pays des Iroquois, par le P. Claude Chauchetière, de la province de Guienne, S. J., avec un avant-propos," see Matteson, *List of Manuscripts concerning American History preserved in European Libraries and noted in their Published Catalogues and similar Printed Lists,* Washington, D. C., 1925, 31. The manuscript is incomplete; it was printed *in extenso* by Rochemonteix, III, 641-678, reprinted and translated into English in *Jesuit Relations,* 63, 140-244. Cf. also, *Relations inédites,* I, 179-189; 279-293; II, 49-70; 167-179; 217-227.

[72] *Relations inédites,* II, 66-67, 167.

> M. le Comte de Frontenac, solicited by malignant persons, resolved to prevent a chapel being built at Sault St. Louis, but did not succeed. He then resolved to prevent the Indians from aggrandizing their fields, and in effect, he saw to it that no land be given to the Indians above the Sault. He often threatened the Indians with imprisonment and other penalties. In a word, he would have desired no mission at all.[73]

Frontenac's ordinance of 1673 forbade brandy selling at La Prairie while Indians were there. Now since they had moved, a saloon might be opened. There were protests from the French settlers, who knew what disorders such an institution would cause. They appealed to Frontenac, reminding him of his previous ordinance. The appellants were condemned. A saloon was allowed at La Prairie, but it was forbidden to sell drink to the Indians of Sault St. Louis. The "greatest governor" cuts rather a sorry figure in his treatment of poor, defenseless natives, who did not want to drink French brandy, and who did not buy their necessities from the Sieur de la Salle's shop at Cataracouy. It is an example of the loudly heralded "politique indigène" so much extolled by Lorin. The viewpoint of the missionaries was quite different:

> The malice of men brought things to such a pitch this year, 1679, that we were threatened from all sides with untoward happenings that were to befall the mission. Now, it was said that a warehouse would be built above the village, where what was brought to and from Cataracouy would be stored and that there was an order from the Crown to this effect; now, it was said that the captain of our village would be put in jail in Montreal. They accused this Indian of being the cause of the confusion, they wanted to make him responsible for what the heathen Iroquois were doing. Again, it was said liquor was about to be introduced in the village. This was held as certain because a Frenchman had come several times, during the summer, with the hope of getting leave to do what he wanted; being a gunsmith, he had rendered himself indispensable to the Indians. Amid these perplexities, these contradictory reports, the poor afflicted missionaries had only recourse to God, who heard their prayers, disposing everything for Father Frémin's voyage to France at the

---

[73] Rochemonteix, III, 660.

end of this year [1679]; [it was] a successful voyage which enabled the mission to triumph over all its adversaries in such a surprising manner that it would deserve a special relation.[74]

The preceding brief sketch goes far toward explaining why Frontenac was opposed to Frémin, who was stoutly resisting attempts at wrecking his mission. Frémin's letter, charging the Jesuits at Prairie de la Madeleine with trading, is rather famous for its absence. It was never given to Colbert or to Louis XIV, for their action subsequent to the arrival of the Jesuit in France in 1679, was quite the reverse of what should have occurred had the letter reached their hands. Louis XIV, after the missionary's visit, sent a peremptory order to Frontenac to stop browbeating the Indians of the Sault, for he, the king, had granted the land they needed. Quite probably there was a letter of Frémin. Though it was never produced, the hypothesis in view of the action taken is that its contents did not expose the Jesuits as traders. Rather it may have given the total trade of the Indians at the Sault as 4,000 livres a year. Rumor had 20,000 livres as the profit there, a great amount diverted, to be sure, from the till in the shop of Frontenac's partner at Cataracouy. But it was in fact only 4,000 livres, and this from all the trade carried on by the Indians. Frémin as superior of the mission was tutor of the Indians settled at the Sault,[75] much more numerous[76] than the handful at Cataracouy, and what he most likely acknowledged was that all his Indians were still but small competitors. Until it is found, this hypothesis fits the facts much better than the assertion that the Jesuits were engaged in trade. If a letter by Father Frémin acknowledging a trade profit of 4,000 livres a year in one of the Jesuit missions had been written, it would have reached the hands of Colbert and those of Louis XIV. If so, would the minister have ordered payment to the Jesuits of a 5,000 livres grant for the years 1679, 1680, and 1681?[77] And would the king have issued his decree of amortization of 1678, countersigned by Colbert, a few months after having received the information? The famous 4,000 livres were the legitimate profits made by the Indians of the Sault, who had as much right to trade as any other natives in America, as much right as those of Fort Frontenac, and as much to trade in America as the French and the protégés of the governor.

---

[74] *Ibid.,* 664-665.

[75] Just as the Jesuits in South America took care of the affairs of the natives "a raison de l'incapacité des Indiens," Charlevoix, *Histoire du Paraguay,* 3 vols., Paris, 1756, III, Pièces justificatives, ccxlxiii.

[76] In 1674, there was an increase of more than 200, *Relations inédites,* I, 287; Father Enjalran wrote that there were 300 Iroquois in 1676, *Jesuit Relations,* 60, 144. In his report on the state of the missions in New France, Dablon wrote to the Cardinals of the Propaganda, Rome, that there were more than four hundred Indians at the Sault in 1679. "Maius [than the one in Lorette] aliud Templum aedificavimus eorum gratia Iroquaeorum qui patrium, uti jam diximus, solum mutant, Christianam inter Gallos Religionem liberius sanctiusque professuri: Eorum in vicum unum coactorum jam numerus . . . ad quadringentos et amplius. . . ." Dablon ad EE. RR. DD., Idibus Novembris, [November 13], 1679, ASJ, Gal., 110, III, 375. The same year, 1679, Frontenac wrote to the king that the Indians at the Sault were "en grand nombre," Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 6, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 108. In 1685, there were 682 Indians at Saint François Xavier du Saut, that is, the Prairie de la Made-

The maid rejoicing in the name of Marie Félix is twice cited in the letter and thus willy-nilly comes into history as an authority by reason of her declaration. First, Father Chaumonot is recorded to have forbidden the Indians to buy from the merchants, since all the Indian requirements could be found in "their warehouse." From the context this was the Jesuit warehouse. Later, the clever maid, the letter asserts, told in her best Parisian French how the Indians were "forced to buy all they needed from one Hazeur,[78] apparently one of their factors." (Note the apparently.) These words are not in the text but in the margin and added afterwards by Bernou. Lahontan commented caustically on the supposed factors: "I've been inform'd by several persons, that the Jesuits drive great trade in European Commodities, and *Canada* skins; but I can scarce believe it, or at least if it be so, they must have Correspondents and Factors that are as close and cunning as themselves; which can

---

leine of former days, *Mgr de Saint-Vallier et l'Hôpital général de Québec,* Quebec, 1882, 56.

[77] See the official "Estats de la depense" for these years, AC, B 8:10, 40, 85.

[78] Cf. R[oy], P. G. "Notes sur François Hazeur," in BRH, XXII, 1926, 705-711.

never be."[79] In other words, if the Jesuits had had factors the secret would not have been kept long, especially in New France where each spied upon the other, as Lahontan, Baugy, and other writers testify.

Now, having disposed of the last of the several "proofs" on the list "furnished" by Bernou, we turn to the top of the list. What the two instances of Denison and Allain prove is difficult to see. Nor is there proof of trade in the fact that the missionaries of the Ottawa country bought the goods from these Frenchmen, who had been ordered to leave the Northwest in accordance with the declaration of the king. They, it may be noted in passing, had not then left the Great Lakes region and did not leave during Frontenac's first term. The governor by adducing such evidence that the Jesuits were at trade because they had allegedly bought merchandises from these traders rather than from those of Quebec, succeeded in making himself ridiculous.

Far and away more serious was the charge against the Jesuits of treachery: they traded with the English, sympathized with them, helped them, acknowledged the jurisdiction of these heretics, of these traditional enemies of France over the Iroquois country. Verily, the missionaries were traitors to their Faith and France. In these accusations against the patriotism of the Jesuits, the governor stoops very low indeed.

The devotion of the missionaries to the French interests was traditional. The English could conceive of no more formidable adversaries than the Jesuits. Without the help of those same Jesuits, who disposed the Iroquois to go to Cataracouy in 1673,[80] it is not idle to surmise how great a fiasco the powwow would have been. The governor sent a Jesuit, Father Albanel, to counteract the machinations of Groseillers.[81] If we may judge by the complaints of the English, the Jesuit was successful.[82] Father Nouvel, then at Sault Ste. Marie, also warned Frontenac of the pro-English activities of patriot Groseillers,[83] who, if he had been willing to share his trade profits with the abbés in France would have been made as great a hero as La Salle was made later on.[84] It is rather an astonishing thing that the governor should wish to make use of traitors in preference to all others to foil the designs of the English. Frontenac chafed at his need for recourse to the Jesuits in transacting the foreign affairs of his government. He needed the services of those whose knowledge of the country and Indians, whose long experience in the field and on the international frontier, had made them "missionary-diplomats."[85] His inferiority in these matters irked the governor. In place of thanks for their help, the Jesuits got from him the vile appellation of renegade traitors.

---

[79] *New Voyages to North America,* I, 385-386.

[80] AC, C 11A, 4:5-9; *Relations inédites,* I, 345-348; Margry, I, 239-243; Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 36.

[81] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 50.

[82] Eastman, 144.

Why were not the treasonable letters of Fathers Bruyas and Lamberville produced? The first of these, Frontenac, at the beginning of his term, was glad to use in order to penetrate the designs of the English. He ordered the missionary to send a trusted Indian to Albany, to spy upon the Dutch and get information.[86] As Frontenac was about to close his letter, Bruyas' courier arrived in Quebec. Lest the information received from a Jesuit should appear useful, he chose to disparage it. The letter from the missionary, which just arrived, "seemed to contain a contradiction"; Frontenac does not understand the speech of the head of the embassy as reported by the Jesuit. Such language can only come from

> people [Jesuits, of course], who fear much more than the Indians to be watched closely, and who, knowing well that this establishment [Fort Frontenac] may one day lead to the posts which are only known to and occupied by them [Jesuits], would wish to show the uselessness of this establishment, by the assurances which they say the Dutch gave that they will not attack us and will only remain on the defense. [Such language can only come from people with such designs] rather than from a

---

[83] AC, C 11A, 4:5v; Nouvel to Frontenac, May 29, 1673, *Relations inédites,* 344.

[84] Cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 11, 98, and the letters of Bernou to Renaudot, in BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7487:90, 97v, 107, 154, 171.

[85] Eastman, 146.

[86] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 45.

man who loves his country, who, to win over to the interests of his country, should, it seems to me, rather hide our losses than admit the wretched state to which the king has brought it. The trouble in all this is that we are only told just what they [*on, i. e.,* Bruyas and the Jesuits] want to let us know, and what they [*on*] think will promote their interests, since there is nobody there to tell the truth about the situation. I hope, however, now that the Sr. Lemoyne will spend the winter on the spot [Iroquois country], I shall be able to unravel everything, and to know the real dispositions of the Dutch and of the Indians; for, as I said, he has much communication and much influence with the latter.[87]

Whatever the Jesuits did, it is evident, was wrong in the eyes of Frontenac. His morbid pride, his psychopathic suspicions made him see plots against the shop at Cataracouy in everything they attempted, and wrote and said. The present writer did not find this letter sent by Bruyas, but the one written June 12, 1673, a few months before, is extant.[88] It is an enthusiastic greeting to the governor. The Jesuit announced the coming to Quebec of an Iroquois contingent and assured Frontenac that the Indians would trade with the French in Montreal rather than with the Dutch. In his second letter, Father Bruyas made the mistake of faithfully reporting what the Indian sent to Albany had said. The news was not pleasing to the governor, who as a consequence thought the Jesuit was not attached to his country. Frontenac evidently sought to poison the mind of the minister. He does not accuse the missionary outright of being a traitor. With characteristic caution he merely says that the letter "seems to contain a contradiction," and that the writer, "it seems to him, has no great love for his country." Again, Bruyas had invited the sieur D'Allerais to trade with New York, we are told in the memoir of 1678. These same two misdeeds, attributed to Bruyas, were laid at the door of Frontenac two years later, but with the difference that Duchesneau sent unanswerable proofs of his accusation to Paris. There is a constant repetition, throughout

---

[87] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 50-51.

[88] Bruyas to Frontenac, June 12, 1673, *Relations inédites,* I, 345-346; Margry, I, 341.

Frontenac's first term, of his charging others with the very misdeeds of which he was guilty.

The treasonable letter of Father de Lamberville, one is supposed to believe, was written to La Salle, who had publicly professed to be "Frontenac's man."[89] To write such a letter were indeed tantamount to a lunatic act rather than treason. Granted it was written, how is it that two years later, when in a letter to one of his business associates, La Salle spoke of the "good friends of M. Andros,"[90] namely, the Jesuits, but made no mention of this letter addressed to him? The explorer wanted to malign his former brethren by connecting them with Andros. He knew that the year before, while he was engaged in illicit trade on the Great Lakes, they had sent vital information to the governor about the designs of Andros who had come back from England.[91] Can it be believed that, if Frontenac had doubted the loyalty of the Jesuits, he would have acted as he did a few years later? At the beginning of 1682, when war was threatening the colony, the governor turned to the Jesuits of Quebec for counsel, and held a meeting in the Jesuit house of Quebec.[92] To the Jesuits of the Ottawa country, he entrusted the orders which were to be communicated to the Indian allies if war with the Iroquois should break out.[93] At that time too, the traitor Lamberville was of greater assistance to the governor than was the Sieur de La Salle, the slanderous recipient of a supposed treasonable letter, who impugned the patriotism of the apostle of the Onondaga Indians.[94]

Thus far the analysis of the memoir. At about the time Bernou was fashioning it, the charge of trade came in an anonymous communication to the Assistant to the General of the Society in Rome. One cannot fail to remark a certain cowardly feature in the accusations, letters in cipher, insinuations, general statements which cannot be checked, and specific statements easily refuted. However, the matter was too serious for dismissal without inquiry by the highest authority of the Order. Incidentally, such inquiries were launched each time the accusation was renewed. The Assistant for France wrote from Rome to Father Dablon, then Superior General of the Canadian Missions and Rector of the College of Quebec, ordering him to explain.

---

[89] Faillon, III, 495.

[90] Margry, II, 219. Margry feared the reader would not understand who was meant, he italicized these words; it is unnecessary to say that in BN, Clairambault, 1016:172, the words are not underscored.

[91] Frontenac to Colbert, October 9, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 102; Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 6, 1679, RAPQ, 1927, 108.

[92] NYCD, IX, 168-173.

[93] AC, C 11A, 6:12.

[94] Cf. *ibid.,* 15, 21, 47-48v; NYCD, IX, 193; *Jesuit Relations,* 62, 154.

Father Louis André had asked his immediate Superior, Father Dablon, for a general leave to run the finances of his mission on an independent basis, that is, independently of the mother house of Quebec. Such permission could not be granted by Father Dablon, who advised Father André to write to Rome. The missionary showed his Superior the Latin petition he was sending to the General with a view to obtaining that permission. Dablon felt he must explain a passage of the same petition lest it be misunderstood in Europe:

> He [Father André] uses the word *merces,* which might lead one to believe that it is question of merchandise. By this word *merces,* however, he means the money in use among the Indians who do not know what money is so that one is forced to buy from them Indian corn, meat, fish, and other things by exchange, giving in exchange instead of money, porcelain beads, knives, awls, and other things which serve as money among them.

The Jesuits had been saying the same for the past thirty years. Surely, Frontenac and other critics in Canada were not unaware of this method of exchange.[95] Yet they chose to speak of it as *faire la traite;* they knew the expression was equivocal, and they needed a misunderstanding of the term in France to lend color to their accusations. Father Dablon then passes to the anonymous denunciator:

---

[95] It was noted above how Frontenac himself had written to Colbert that in Canada furs were a kind of money. In that same letter he wrote to the minister that the militia men of Canada were disarmed "pour avoir *traité* leurs fusils," RAPQ, 1927, 16. "Beaver pelts," wrote La Chesnaye in 1670, "are the sole source of revenue of Canada, and its money . . . ," Memoire sur le prix du Castor, AC, C 11A, 3:150.

This gives me the occasion to enlighten Your Reverence with regard to what you wrote about the trade which is spoken of in the anonymous letter sent to our Father General, and which is carried on by our brother [Joseph] Boursier [dit Desforges], who, the anonymous writer alleges, is selling wooden shoes, rings, pins, and so forth. I communicated the letter of our Father General and that of Your Reverence to our Fathers Consultors here. Together we have carefully examined everything, and we have judged that brother Boursier, who is the buyer for this house, is doing nothing but what his predecessors have always done.

Secondly, he is doing nothing but what the secular clergy here, the priests of St. Sulpice in Montreal, the Ursulines and the *Hospitalières* are doing.

Thirdly, it is necessary to proceed in this manner in this country, namely, by exchange, as is done in the Islands [French West Indies] by means of sugar, in the Indies by means of pearls.[96] The reason is that in all these countries, there is no specie, or so little that it amounts to nothing; so that, to buy the provisions necessary to live, we must give in exchange cloth, linen, and other things sent us from France or bought from the merchants here, such as wheat, meat, and the other necessities of life.

Fourthly, if our brother buyer asked that many little things be sent to him from France as thread, needles, and so forth, he did this out of charity, in order to help the peasants who work for him and who could not get these things elsewhere. Far from finding fault with this course of action, he is on the contrary blessed by every one.

Fifthly, our brother buyer parts with these things which take the place of money in two cases only; first, to pay his debts; secondly, to buy our needs, such as wheat, meat, milk, and so forth.

From all this you can judge that it is a great malice on the part of the anonymous writer, who wishes to make us appear as merchants when we are only doing what has always been done in this colony, what the priests and the nuns are doing, and what is done either out of clarity or through necessity, since it is the custom of the country to obtain the necessities of life by permutation.[97]

---

[96] As tobacco in Virginia.

[97] ASJ, Gal., I, 110:64-65; an extract from this letter is in Rochemonteix, III, 138, note 1.

This letter of Dablon explains the declaration made fourteen years previously before the Sovereign Council, which Parkman chose to understand as an "admission in thin disguise" of trade. It also explains the declaration of Montmagny of 1647, from which Parkman inferred that the Jesuits "actually traded though with good intentions." The charity of the brother buyer apparently piqued some grasping merchants of Quebec, who, by the bye, were cheating everybody in Quebec and especially the Indians.[98] They wished to force even the brother to buy his stuffs from them. As Lahontan averred:

> There's no difference between the Pyrates that scowr the Seas, and the *Canada* Merchants . . . I have known twenty little Pedlars that had not above a thousand Crowns stock when I arriv'd at *Quebec,* in the year 1683; and when I left that place had got to the tune of twelve thousand Crowns. 'Tis an unquestion'd truth, that they get fifty *per Cent* upon all the Goods they deal in, whether they buy 'em up upon the arrival of the Ships at *Quebec,* or have 'em from *France* by way of Commission; but over and above that, there are some little gaudy Trinkets, such as Ribbands, Laces, Embroideries, Tobacco-Boxes, Watches and an infinity of other baubles of Iron Ware, upon which they get a hundred and fifty *per Cent,* all Costs clear.[99]

Poor people were not buying these baubles at an arbitrary and exorbitant price; they could obtain them in payment for their services in or around the college of Quebec; they were paid their salary with what they most desired. If that is trade, the Jesuits of Canada traded, and the poor blessed them for it. To be blessed by the poor for doing what is universally allowed and legitimate is infinitely more to be prized than to be praised by a coterie of rapacious adventurers for not doing it.

It may be said that Father Dablon was speaking of what took place in Quebec. Could not the Jesuits carry on trade in the missions and the letter of Father Dablon still be true or partly true? If trade had been carried on by the Jesuits on the scale spoken of by some critics, the anonymous writer would have known it. He would evidently have had a better case than that of the few pins and needles used as money by the buyer of the college of Quebec. What took place in the missions is set forth in a letter to the General of the Order by one who, when he wrote, had been nearly sixty years in the missions of Canada. The letter is dated October 21, 1717, long after Frontenac had passed from the scene. The writer, Father Julien Garnier, was a veteran missionary. He had arrived in Canada in 1660, had lived through the end of the heroic period, had spent years in the Iroquois missions, and he knew the conditions prevailing in New France.[100] At the age of seventy-four, when ordered by the General to explain the nature of the Jesuit trade in New France, it is unlikely that he would hide or varnish the truth.

---

[98] Cf. Lahontan, *New Voyages,* II, 421-422, 535, 591; Hennepin, *New Discovery,* II, 542-543.

[99] Lahontan, *New Voyages,* I, 374.

> Most willingly do I heed your Reverence's command, as you wish to hear from me what is done by some of our missionaries with regard to the commerce of pelts.
> First. In the remotest regions [the Ottawa country, for instance] whence the French bring here [Quebec] most of the pelts, our Fathers are commanded not to engage either directly or indirectly in any kind of fur trade whatsoever. Much more than this, they stipulate in the contract [*paciscuntur*] passed with the hired laborers [*engagés*] that they are not to carry on any trade as long as they remain with us, and if they secretly engage in some trade of any consequence, they are either forced to live up to their engagements or they are discharged.

The importance of this statement showing the practice of the missionaries is better realized when we recall how the lesser calumniators of those days claimed that if the Jesuits themselves did not trade, the *engagés* did. This declaration also disposes of the gratuitous assertion of Parkman about the *engagés* trading with the Indians for the profit of the missions. Father Garnier pursues:

> Secondly. There is up there [Ottawa country] one of our coadjutor brothers who is a blacksmith, and whose work earns for our Fathers the necessities of life. He repairs the guns and all that is necessary for hunting, fishing, and other activities.

---

[100] Cf. Lafitau, *Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriquains . . .*, I, 2-3.

For his salary he asks the Indians for meat, fish, Indian corn, etc.; and from those who have no victuals, he accepts whatever they offer, even pelts. From the French he accepts merchandises, stuff, linen, etc., for in that place, neither gold nor silver is used as specie.

Thirdly. Our Fathers accept pelts or other things which are freely offered by the Indians, because the latter feel offended if their gifts are not accepted, although they hardly ever give anything except in the hope of receiving in return more than they have given.

Fourthly. [In that place] it is more often the case for the French to offer pelts to the Church either in fulfilment of some vow made in time of peril, or in order that what is useful or conducive to the ornamentation of the temple may be bought.

Fifthly. In the neighboring missions [Lorette, Sault St. Louis, Sillery] where all the Indians are Christians, when some one dies, all that belonged to the deceased, to which his relatives also add something of their own, is offered to the church, or to the more fervent Christians, or to the poorer Indians of the village, or, and this is the most common occurrence, to the Church in order that prayers be said for the deceased, that masses be celebrated [for the repose of his soul].[101] That which is given to the Church is called church property, and the missionary takes care of it as guardian. When the Indians leave for the hunt, each one borrows from the church what he is most in need of, and pledges himself to return to the church part of the product of his hunt [for what he has borrowed]. Others, when their hunt has been successful, spontaneously offer pelts to the church in thanksgiving to God; while others still offer pelts that a solemn mass be celebrated for their deceased parents.

The missionary keeps all these things until the time the ships come from France, that he may buy at a lower price what is useful for the temple or for its decoration, or again to buy what is useful for the poor, the widows and the orphans. This is what renders the missionary suspect of trade on the part of the more ignorant Frenchmen, who, craving only for gain, consider as stolen from their pockets whatever comes into other people's hands. The missionary, however, does not become, nor does he intend to become richer by these transactions. He merely takes care of that which belongs to the church and is performing an act of charity.[102]

---

[101] Cf. *Relations inédites,* I, 310, II, 55, 76; Chauchetière, Narration annuelle de la mission du Sault, in Rochemonteix, III, 656.

Frenchmen are not lacking who are so eager for gain that by means fair or foul they would willingly snatch away the pelts from the Indians. When these borrow from the French, they charge the highest price, twice dearer than the ordinary price. Hence, the Indians are driven to the English, not far distant from here. Their faith is jeopardized by the English and by their fellow tribesmen who are opposed to the religion they intend to profess here. Wishing to prevent this evil, a missionary supplied the neophytes with their necessities at a moderate price. Thereupon the French spread the rumor that he was engaged in trade. To remove even the appearance of evil, I transferred that missionary to the French [settlements]. Now the Indians are complaining that a very kind father who took care of them in their spiritual and corporal necessities has been taken away from them. Thus far about trade.[103]

A detailed examination of Frontenac's correspondence has revealed in "the official despatches of the most noted of Canadian governors," *one* letter which contains specific instances of Jesuit trade. These "proofs" were sent shortly after the promulgation in Quebec of the trade ordinance of 1676. The ordinance had as its object a curtailment of the profits Frontenac derived from the *congé* game, which with the unrelenting opposition of the Jesuits to the brandy trade was unbearable to the governor. That Frontenac in contravention to the orders of the king levied a tribute on the merchants of Canada and shared in the profits of the trade of the coureurs de bois is not and cannot be denied by the governor's admirers.[104] As far as the present writer is concerned, it is a matter of indifference whether Frontenac and his satellites traded or not. The great majority of colonial officials sent to New France traded,[105] and looked upon their position first and foremost as a means of getting rich quickly. Hence, the shady *tripotages,* the jobberies, the graft of the governor are discussed only because the writer contends that he accused the Jesuits of trade mainly to divert attention from his own violations of the orders of the king.

---

[102] See *supra,* p. 195, note 75.

[103] ASJ, Gal., I, 110:326-327.

[104] Lahontan, *New Voyages to North America,* I, 382; Gravier, *Cavelier de la Salle,* 36; Parkman, *Frontenac,* 63; Lorin, 183-185, 426. Anyone who consults the contemporary records will be as surprised as Faillon was, III, 456, when reading of Frontenac in Charlevoix, *Histoire et Description,* II, 237, that "on ne l'accusa jamais d'être intéressé," that he "was never accused of self interest," as Shea translates this sentence, V, 94.

[105] Cf. Tronson to Dollier, May 25, 1683, no. 210; April 18, 1684, no. 231; April 20, 1684, no. 256. Parkman, *Old Régime,* 305.

The government in Paris had reason for prohibiting officials in New France to trade. In 1675, Colbert, writing to Frontenac, assured him he did not believe the current talk about trade being carried on in the governor's name, but he warned him to beware lest his servants and friends engage in it for fear the colonists would lose confidence in his impartiality.[106] Most of the trouble during Frontenac's first term was rooted in trade rivalries, despite the fanfare about "honors" to be paid the governor. In 1676, the king in telling Frontenac to stop the trade which he had accused "les ecclésiastiques" of carrying on, also reminded him: "for the sake of good example not to allow his servants or any other person to trade in your name or by your authority; and I even forbid you ever to issue any license or permit for the [Indian] trade."[107]

Frontenac's men were using their positions to facilitate their own acquirement of the *congés* which the governor had been forbidden to grant.[108] The *congés* can be described best by one word of present-day coinage and implication—a "racket." The tribute coming to the governor was levied directly and paid in cash, and thus all traces of the transaction were obliterated. And hence the governor could assure the king that no one could produce proof of the affair.[109] But the mail bringing this statement to France also brought Duchesneau's circumstantiated account, wherein Frontenac was exposed as in partnership with coureurs de bois. The governor had been ordered repeatedly to rid the colony of these, among whom were Duluth and La Taupine, covertly protected by him.[110] The yearly trip of Frontenac to Montreal, Duchesneau asserted, was prompted by something more tangible than a good-will visit to the Indians. A personal tax had to be paid, "a certain number of packages of beaver skins," which Frontenac called his "presents," had to be handed in before trading could begin.[111]

---

[106] Colbert to Frontenac, May 30, 1675, RAPQ, 1927, 85.

[107] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 15, 1676, NYCD, IX, 126.

[108] Cf. the procès-verbal of August 12, 1680, in AC, F 3, 2:66.

[109] Frontenac to Louis XIV, November 6, 1679, AC, C 11A, 5:114, RAPQ, 1927, 106. It is not probable that the writer of the following lines was ever much interested in or ever made a study of the economic conditions of New France under Frontenac; yet by changing only a few words, one finds an adequate description of the state of affairs in Canada during Frontenac's time. "A racket [congés] can never exist in any area where the law is enforced. A racketeer [coureur de bois] thrives on the cupidity of politicians and the weakness of law enforcement agencies [Frontenac in New France]. There are ample laws on the statute book of every state [for instance, the

Of course, writers lost in admiration for the governor, put no credence in Duchesneau's declarations. They discard it on the ground that the intendant too was trading.[112] They betray impatience even as did Colbert, when proofs of the governor's partnership with and protection of coureurs de bois were sent to Paris. Colbert wrote to Duchesneau quite critically of the spirit of the letters, which, he said, "prevents me from believing what you say about his trade; nor can I trust the copies of the documents you are sending

---

ordinances, decrees and orders of Louis XIV] to make racketeering difficult if not impossible, should the police and other law enforcement authorities wish to end the practice [which is what the king wrote to the governor]. It is, therefore, an axiom that if a racket exists officials are lax [the king did not speak otherwise]. . . . The racketeer pays for his right to mulct others, not only of their money and possessions, but also of their legal rights [namely, the right of all the inhabitants in New France to trade with the Indians by holding fairs at stated times and places]. He is a protected person. He is always protected in his privilege to violate the law and the rights of others. It must be assumed, even where it cannot be proved, that he pays for such protection. Whether he splits with politicians or works under some other arrangement, the racketeer is responsible to the politician. The man higher up in every racket is a politician. Even where racketeers have been caught and convicted, . . . rarely, if ever, are the political protectors of the racketeers apprehended. They are hardly ever bothered, because the tie-up is remote and generally unprovable." George Sokolsky, "Rackets and Labor," *The Atlantic Monthly,* CLXII, 1938, 392-393.

[110] Duchesneau to Colbert, November 10, 1679, AC, C 11A, 5:39, NYCD, IX, 131.

[111] *Id.* to *id.,* AC, C 11A, 5:46v, NYCD, IX, 134-135. Frontenac went to Montreal, not so much to prevent likely brawls between French and Indians, cf. Lorin, 184, but the governor went to the Montreal fair "to get his share of the pie," as Lahontan bluntly puts it, *New Voyages,* I, 54; cf. Louis XIV, to Duchesneau, April 30, 1681, AC, B 8, 82v.

[112] Parkman, *Frontenac,* 63, Lorin, 183.

me to prove it. You must send the originals."[113] But in the following year, 1679, when the latest letters of Frontenac and of Duchesneau were in and the matter examined, the minister, Frontenac's constant supporter, wrote him. The king has seen "all the documents you sent me to prove that it is the intendant who is supporting them [coureurs de bois] and who is sharing in the profits of their trade. His Majesty orders me to tell you that . . . as the public depositions are always against you, and the documents themselves which are produced are much stronger, His Majesty can not help having more faith in these depositions and documents which are against you than in those which you have sent against other people. Those which you have sent have appeared to His Majesty as a mere form of recrimination. . . ."[114]

There was not much improvement in 1680.[115] The year following, the king notified the intendant of the governor's assurance to His Majesty that the orders received about trade and the coureurs de bois would be obeyed.[116] Frontenac indeed was sending denials to his friends, to Colbert, and to the king.[117] But Louis XIV was not satisfied with mere verbal protests. "You have not executed my orders on one of the most important points for the good of my service," namely, the union the king expected between the two officials. To Frontenac's accusation of trading against Duchesneau, the king replied: "I can only repeat what I have said in my former letters. All that you write about the commerce of the intendant and the interest he takes in the coureurs de bois seems to spring from a spirit of recrimination rather than based on a real foundation." If Frontenac had done his duty, said Louis XIV, there would not be so many coureurs, "and I cannot accept the reason you allege that their number comes from the connivance of the intendant."[118]

---

[113] Colbert to Duchesneau, May 15, 1678, Clément, III², 633.

[114] Colbert to Frontenac, April 4, 1680, RAPQ, 1927, 113, this letter in Clément, III², 643, is dated December 4, 1679.

[115] Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 13, 1680, NYCD, IX, 143.

[116] Louis XIV to Duchesneau, April 13, 1681, AC, C 11A, 5:340v, *id.* to *id.,* April 30, 1681, AC, B 8:80. This is the same letter but the date differs in the two series.

[117] Cf. letters to Frontenac to [Bellefonds], AC, C 11A:158-158v; RAPQ, 1927, 117, to Colbert, *ibid.,* 269, to Louis XIV, *ibid.,* 277, 281, etc.

The harsh tone of Colbert's letters to Duchesneau has been contrasted with that of the minister's letters to Frontenac.[119] Fault has been found with the relentless drive of Duchesneau,[120] who, year after year, in spite of rebuffs from Colbert, told how Frontenac profited by the fur trade and protected law-breakers. Judging from their letters to Frontenac, neither the king nor Colbert seem to have minced their words with the governor. As for the intendant, he merely defended himself, answering accusations of Frontenac with circumstantiated proofs, and so to speak, forcing the court to believe him. By 1681, Duchesneau had been writing for six years, even since he came to Canada, yet, he asserts, in his complaints he named specifically only seven, Frontenac, Chartier, Perrot, La Salle, Duluth, Bécancour, and Bolduc.

> I have never written anything about the Count de Frontenac without proving it with documents, which I have sent to Paris. And in doing this, I only obeyed the orders of the king, without considering my private interest, according to which I had all to gain by getting along with him [Frontenac] . . . I could not keep silent with regard to the conduct of the Sieurs Perrot, although a relative of my wife, de la Salle, and Duluth.[121]

If he said Frontenac was working hand in glove with the coureurs de bois, he had proved his statement beyond cavil. In another letter of the same date, the intendant writes:

> In regard to the coureurs de bois, and the protection which I last year stated had been given them by M. de Frontenac, and the interest he has in common with them, I could not help reporting it, since what I stated on this point was not advanced without reflection, and I had transmitted the proofs whereof; and the governor's conduct again this year, which I shall explain

---

[118] Louis XIV to Frontenac, April 30, 1681, AC, C 11A, 5:349-352; Clément, III², 644-645.

[119] Lorin, 160, cf. Parkman, *Frontenac,* 55.

[120] Lorin, 159 ff.

[121] Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 13, 1681, AC, C 11A, 5:295v-296v.

to you in course, will convince you that the affair of the coureurs de bois was his.[122]

Duchesneau, indeed, was using his right of self defense. Frontenac, who found profit in protecting the coureurs de bois, had accused the intendant of doing precisely what he himself was doing. One of the reasons why Frontenac's partisans resent Duchesneau's accusations is because the intendant defended himself, just as certain writers cannot forgive the Jesuits for having defended themselves against the accusations of Frontenac, La Salle, and Cadillac.[123] Having made heroes of very ordinary adventurers, they chose to consider any criticism of these adventurers as aspersions on their own character. "My Lord," says the intendant elsewhere in the letter quoted above, "as to what regards the representation I transmitted relative to the conduct of Sieur Perrot, Governor of Montreal, of which His Majesty informs me I did not send any proofs, you will admit, my Lord, by those I send you this year, that I have not written anything but the truth."[124]

In 1674, Frontenac had tried to break Perrot's business.[125] Modern slang terminology for Frontenac's maneuver would have it accurately and descriptively as "muscling in." After the return of the governor of Montreal, Frontenac realized how much better an understanding with Perrot would be. The latter was amenable. There was enough money for two.[126] Frontenac had also recognized Perrot as a power to be reckoned with because of his friends and connections, and hence chose to be friendly. Duchesneau wrote:

---

[122] Duchesneau's memoir of November 13, 1681, NYCD, IX, 152.

[123] Cf. Rochemonteix, III, iii.

[124] NYCD, IX, 154.

[125] This affair is too well known to need repeating, the best and most complete account is that of Faillon, III, 457 ff., and 464 ff. Lorin's endeavors, 169, 183, to show that there was a difference between the trade of Perrot and that of Frontenac are supported by no shred of evidence.

[126] In 1683, news reached Paris that Perrot had sold for 100,000 livres worth of beaver pelts at Niort, cf. Tronson to Dollier, May 25, 1683, n. 210. "Mr *Perot* the Governor of the Town, who had but a thousand Crowns a year Sallary; had made shift to get fifty thousand crowns, [*écus,* or one hundred and fifty thousand livres] in a few years, by trading with the Savages in Skins and Furs," Lahontan, *New Voyages,* I, 53.

Inasmuch as the details of matters, so important as those which I have just laid before you, my Lord, cannot be embraced in one letter, I have, in order to avoid being too importunate, thought proper to submit them in special memoirs supported by proper proofs.

The first will show you that the king's commands are not executed, that justice is overpowered, that its officers are persecuted and the guilty remain unpunished.

The second will lay before you the disorders created by the coureurs de bois; what has encouraged the disobedience to the king's orders, and still sustains it; and the fact that an open trade is carried on with the English, to whom our peltries are conveyed to the prejudice of the king's contractors, who purchase those peltries much dearer and sell their merchandise cheaper than we do.

The third will convince you, my Lord, of all that I communicated last year relative to Sieur Perrot, governor of Montreal. You will notice the continuance of his ill conduct, as well as that of Sieur de la Salle, governor of Fort Frontenac, and of Sieur Duluth, Captain of the coureurs de bois, and discover some private associations very prejudicial to the country.[127]

Section 3. La Salle's Accusations

The name of La Salle as a partner of Frontenac often recurs in the letters of Duchesneau. And with good reason, for the explorer was at this time a superior type of coureur de bois.[1] Under the circumstances of partnership and pursuit, one might expect La Salle to accuse Jesuits of trade. And so, as Parkman wrote: "La Salle gives many other particulars, especially relating to Michilimackinac, where, as he says, the Jesuits had a large stock of beaver-skins."[2] The "many other particulars" are reviewed below, and what La Salle actually wrote will be examined.

La Salle arriving in Canada in the latter part of 1667, made an attempt at colonization near Montreal. He soon tired of it. After selling the land given him by the Sulpicians, he accompanied, in 1669, Dollier and Galinée in their Western expedition. He feigned sickness, parted with the two Sulpicians, spent the next few years roaming the woods, and traded in the Iroquois country.[3] It was because of his knowledge of this section of the country that Frontenac commissioned him to go to the various Jesuit missionaries with a message to prepare the Iroquois for the meeting with the governor at Cataracouy in the summer of 1673.[4]

---

[127] NYCD, IX, 157-158.

[1] The characterization is Eastman's, 193, speaking of La Salle in 1678.

[2] *Old Régime,* 329.

Out of gratitude for this commission and in the hope of further bounties, La Salle took sides with the governor in the Fénelon affair. He had met the governor, most probably for the first time in Quebec after the Cataracouy powwow,[5] and back in Montreal proclaimed "himself openly M. de Frontenac's man. One and all he cautioned to be on their guard when speaking in his presence of the governor, for he, La Salle, would not fail to report all that might interest the person of M. de Frontenac."[6] How completely La Salle had passed over to the governor's side is better realized when it is remembered that La Salle had been helped by the Sulpicians of Montreal on his arrival in Canada. They had given him an extensive tract of land to start a settlement and they had befriended him in many ways. His ingratitude toward the Sulpicians was on a par with the attitude of hostility he was soon to adopt toward his former brethren, the Jesuits.

The reward from Frontenac came a few months after the scene in the church of Montreal, where, rising up in the middle of Fénelon's sermon, La Salle called the attention of the congregation to the fact that the preacher was censuring the governor. In November 1674, when La Salle was leaving for France, Frontenac highly praised "his man" in a letter to the minister.[7] On this voyage to the mother country, he took a petition to the king for proprietorship and seigniorial rights of Fort Cataracouy, which he immediately baptized Fort Frontenac.[8]

---

[3] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 17 ff.

[4] Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 36, 45; Margry, I, 198; NYCD, IX, 97.

[5] Cf. Lorin, 79, 93, 94.

[6] Faillon, III, 495.

[7] Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, AC, C 11A, 4:84; Margry, I, 277; RAPQ, 1927, 78.

Returning to Canada in 1675, La Salle attempted to found a colony at Fort Frontenac. As far as colonization went, it was a fiasco, just as the attempt at Lachine had been. Fort Frontenac was never more than a *comptoir,* a trading post,[9] and a far from prosperous one. The head of such a post needed certain qualities, which were lacking in La Salle, prudence, a knowledge of men, and the right manner of dealing with them. The post, as a trading center, soon became rather a liability; the trade with the Iroquois on which much store had been set was rapidly diminishing.[10] La Salle found nothing better than to accuse his former brethren of using their influence with the Iroquois to prevent them from coming to trade at his fort. He quite conveniently forgot that it was as easy, if not easier, for the Indians to go to the Dutch where they would be paid three or four times as much for their pelts as they would be at Cataracouy. The Indians were not so foolish and they did not deem the privilege of trading with the seignior of Fort Frontenac worth such a price.

---

[8] NYCD, IX, 122, Margry, I, 278. The petition was granted the following year, NYCD, IX, 123-124, Margry, I, 281.

[9] Faillon, III, 458, 473-474; cf. Baugy, *Journal d'une expédition contre les Iroquois en 1687,* 78. Faillon does not prove his contention, says Lorin, 197-198, who proceeds to show that Fort Frontenac, besides being a trading post, was also a colonization center. When one checks on the texts given by Lorin, a truly novel method of history writing is revealed. The first proof is a quotation from a document saying that a land concession was granted to a sergeant, the implication being that it was cultivated. The second proof is taken from the utterly worthless *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée.* The third proof consists in a quotation from the letters patent of May 12, 1678, as if what is said therein were a proof of what actually took place at Fort Frontenac. The fourth proof is a statement found in the relation of Tonty, which actually contains no word about the colonization supposedly flourishing at Fort Frontenac. Tonty merely says: "Il y a quelques habitations françaises, une maison de recollects et tout proche un village d'Iroquois," Margry, I, 575. These four so-called proofs are crowned with a fifth: "La Salle lui-même, dans un mémoire soumis à Seignelay en 1681, déclarait qu'il y avait autour du fort 'plusieurs habitants français et quantité de nations sauvages jusqu'au nombre de plus de dix-huit mille, qui ont bâti des maisons et ensemencé quantité de terre pour commencer une puissante colonie.' " This is the best proof of all. The document is not by La Salle; it is not of 1681, but of 1684; it does not speak of Fort Frontenac but of Fort St. Louis, in the Illinois country. There were never 18,000 Indians around the Illinois fort, cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 72; Lorin himself had misgivings about this number, see his footnote; and cf. *supra* for the "colonization" at Fort Frontenac.

[10] NYCD, IX, 211.

In 1677, La Salle left his fort and went to France a second time. On May 12, 1678, he was given a commission to achieve the exploration of the Mississippi. He was to finance the expedition out of his own pocket. As a compensation, he was granted ownership and government of forts to be built, and he was to have the monopoly of buffalo hides; but trade with the Ottawa and other tribes bringing their pelts to Montreal was strictly forbidden to him.[11]

While in France at this time, La Salle supposedly had ten or twelve interviews with a friend of M. de Galinée. At these conversations were present very intelligent gentlemen, all endowed with an excellent memory. The anonymous friend of the Sulpician took down in writing what La Salle said, and communicated the report to the aforementioned witnesses of the interview, who unanimously and separately asserted—thanks to their excellent memory—that they well remembered that the written report contained what they had heard La Salle narrate.[12]

A passage of this document has been discussed elsewhere.[13] On the strength of the entry in the *Calendar of Manuscripts,* the document was noted to have been published by Margry with omissions. Considering the purpose of the editor who wished to prove by this single document La Salle's priority in discovering the Mississippi, before Jolliet and Marquette, it was safe to surmise that nothing would be omitted which even remotely supported Margry's contention. Again, it sufficed then to show that the passage from purely internal criticism was worthless as documentary proof of the claimed priority. But in connection with the trade of the Jesuits in New France, a more complete critique is imperative, since this question is aired throughout the document. Another reason is that since his previous use of the *Récit,* a photograph of the complete text has been seen by the present writer.

---

[11] Margry, I, 337; NYCD, IX, 127.

[12] Margry, I, 345-401.

[13] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 48-50.

Parkman called it a "curious monument."[14] With regard to the use made of it to prove La Salle's priority in the discovery of the great river, Winsor wrote:

> There are some embarrassing facts for Margry and his adherents to surmount in any endeavor to put La Salle before Marquette as the actual discoverer of the Mississippi. It was notorious at the time when this *Histoire* [the title of the second part of the document] purports to have been written (1678), that Marquette had first reached the great river in 1673, and in the intervening years there had been no denial of the fact. If this paper [the *Récit*] produced by Margry is genuine, it is strange that La Salle's brother and other kindred, when making, after La Salle's death, a memorial to the king for compensation on account of their kinsman's services, do not mention any such expedition of 1671.
>
> The inference is hardly to be avoided, either that the questionable document has deceived Margry, or that he knows more of its history than he cares to disclose. It is unfortunate that there is any suspicion attached to any paper in the important collection of documents which the United States government has assisted M. Margry to publish.[15]

When Winsor wrote these lines he knew of Margry's unsavory reputation.[16] It may be stated with certainty that the document which will be criticized presently was known by Margry as worthless, from beginning to end, with the exception of the extract of the letter of La Salle, and no one can say how faithfully this is reproduced in the document. The proof that Margry was aware of the worthlessness of the document, aside from his reticences with regard to its provenance, is found in the manner in which he published it. When the whole document is seen, there remains little doubt as to its nature. Margry, indeed, did not "care to disclose" what he knew of the history of the *Récit,* except in a vague manner adding some irrelevant comments, and he certainly did not care to publish the document in full.

---

[14] *La Salle,* 95.

[15] Winsor, *Cartier to Frontenac,* Boston and New York, 1894, 226, 227.

[16] Cf. *Narrative and Critical History of America,* V, 245, the critical discussion is by Winsor himself. In note 1, page 245, Winsor said: "The curious reader interested in M. Margry's career among manuscripts may read R. H. Major's Preface (pp. xxiv-li) to his *Life of Prince Henry of Portugal,* London, 1868. Mr. Major has clearly got no high idea of M. Margry's acumen or honesty from the claim which this Frenchman has put forth, that the instigation of Colombus' views came from France. Cf. Major's *Select Letters of Colombus,* p. xlvii." The present writer succumbed to the curiosity spoken of by Winsor. After studying the documents published by Margry on the discovery of the Mississippi Valley, the conclusion reached is that the Frenchman was as dishonest in editing his second compilation as he had been in that criticized by Major. Cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 4-10.

His acumen, as Major thought, may not have been very sharp, but Margry knew better than to reveal his deficiencies to the educated world. He had indeed given historians in this country to understand that their ideas about the exploration of the Mississippi Valley would have to be revised when he would publish documents in his possession. The great, erroneous idea lay in thinking Jolliet and Marquette the discoverers of the Mississippi. This honor, claimed Margry, was La Salle's. When, thanks to the exertions of Parkman, the United States Government agreed to finance the publication of his papers, the Frenchman had to produce his mysterious documents. As the *Récit* was the *only* proof of the alleged priority, Margry had to publish it, unless he preferred to retract and to admit himself mistaken, and thus confess he had practiced deception with his dark hints as to the true discoverer of the Mississippi. Apparently he was unwilling to do either. On the other hand, he could not publish the document as he found it, because this would also amount to a retraction. Scholars in this country would have detected the hoax immediately and would have pilloried him for ignorance or dishonesty, as scholars in England and in France had done on a previous occasion.

When Margry published his first volume, he felt that he had to say a few words about the authenticity and the provenance of the *Récit.* He said its author, beside being a friend of Galinée, was also a friend of Arnauld. Margry added that the name of the illustrious Jansenist which would be met with in the text, should put the reader on guard against statements of the author of the document. The original, he warned, was found in a sheaf of manuscript writings brought to him, all hostile to the Jesuits.[17]

---

[17] Margry, I, 345, note.

Later, when urged to give more information about the provenance of the document, he merely repeated what he had said in his first volume. When he wanted to see again "this important document" to check the proof sheets of his book, he said he could no longer find it. The last person to see it was Faillon. The papers, among which was the *Récit,* were formerly in the French National Archives, series K 1286, where Margry first saw it, but in the interval they had been transferred to K 1232. In this new file, he recognized many documents he had seen before, but did not find the *Récit* among them.[18] This shapes up to a queer explanation, considering that the document is found today in K 1232, and, what is more, is the first *pièce* of the file.

Faillon saw the document in file K 1286. He gives this press mark for the three statements he took from it.[19] His last reference to the *Récit* is a sort of confirmatory proof of what Faillon had found in the second memoir of M. d'Allet, a Sulpician, published by Arnauld.[20] Harrisse read the reference given by Faillon too hastily. The critic thought by consulting K 1286, p. 53—in the early seventies, K 1232—he would find that the *Jesuit Relations* were suppressed at the request of Courcelle, the Governor of Canada. He found this file filled with documents on Canada, "but these boxes contain no memoirs by M. d'Allet, nor any documents bearing on the [*Jesuit*] *Relations.*"[21] Rochemonteix made capital of this reference to a non-existing document,[22] but both the critic and the Jesuit attributed to Faillon what the historian never said. The typographical appearance of this note shows that it is given merely as a confirmation. The passage in the *Morale Pratique* speaks not only of the suppression of the *Jesuit Relations* at the request of Courcelle, but it also states in general that they had been suppressed because they are full of falsehoods. The latter is what is found in K 1286, p. 53, today in K

---

[18] Margry, III, 626.

[19] Faillon, II, 428, note 1; III, 189, note 2; 312, note 5.

[20] *Morale pratique des Jesuites,* 1716², VII, 334-343.

[21] Harrisse, *Notes pour servir à l'histoire . . . de la Nouvelle-France,* Paris, 1872, 60, note. Cf. Roy, *Rapport sur les Archives de France,* 52, 55-56.

[22] Rochemonteix, I, xxviii f.

1232, and in Margry, I, 374. Such would have been the answer of Faillon, had he been alive when Harrisse published his book.

In the other two passages where the document is quoted, Faillon does not speak of its author, nor of its nature. Having seen it complete, he could not fail to trace the main, ultimate source but for some reason Faillon did not criticize the document. Margry also saw the whole document; he copied it in full, and quoted one paragraph in the introduction to his fifth volume, giving the reference: *Mémoires d'un Sulpicien, Archives Nationales.*[23] But Margry was careful not to say that this memoir which he attributes to a Sulpician was the main source of the *Récit,* nor did he say that he had suppressed the passage in his printed version of the *Récit,* lest one might recognize it, and lest, even without having seen the full text of the document, one might deduce what were its component elements.

The document was divided by Margry into two parts. The title *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée,* and the first subtitle *Entretiens de Cavelier de la Salle sur les onze premières années en Canada,* were added by Margry. The first subdivision covers thirty printed pages, the second twenty-five; the manuscript itself down to where Margry stopped has ninety-eight pages of text.

It is the reporter of these *entretiens* who took great care lest any word falling from the mouth of La Salle be lost. He set down all about the customs of the Indians, their origin, their history, their language, their government, and the state of the Christian religion in North America. Except for the last item, he could have obtained his story from almost any account of the customs of the North America Indians then in print. Here and there are illustrations in which Frontenac figures, and a few events which La Salle witnessed or may have witnessed are added. But our reporter soon tired of being a mere record keeper. He quotes the opinion of other men, for instance, of one Abbé de la Vergne, who had heard something from a missionary, and of Thomas Gage on the Mexican Indians. When he came to the Indian legends, he apparently forgot altogether that La Salle was supposed to be speaking, but caught himself with the sentence: "M. de la Salle was interrupted as he was telling me this." Another peculiar thing is to be noted; in the first twenty pages and throughout the *Récit* for that matter, the recorder deposed that he immediately set down names and dates with particular care, because one is most liable to forget them. Yet, after a few pages, the first time a name was supposedly given by La Salle, it is left out.

---

[23] Margry, V, cxi. Margry's copy is in BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 9288: 18-40.

These same first twenty pages are clearly only a *hors d'oeuvre*. The reporter was hastening toward the last division, the state of the Christian religion in North America. In the very first paragraph of this division, as published, Margry began to suppress what would have led toward the identification of the narrator and the nature of the document. At the beginning of the *Récit* the reporter has La Salle speaking. He gives the explorer a bill of honesty; La Salle is depicted as a man averse to exaggeration, who distinguished perfectly between what he knew and who modestly confessed his ignorance about what he did not know. Margry's task demanded that the reporter be made to appear just as honest, as trustworthy as La Salle. To achieve his task then, in the first paragraph, treating of the state of the Christian religion in America, Margry suppressed two statements, one patently false, the other giving the real source of the reporter's assertion. In the document, let us repeat, La Salle is not speaking, but, in the publication of the same by Margry, La Salle is made to be speaking by the suppression of certain lines. The text as in the document is given below, the words struck out by Margry are italicized.

The Recollects are too poor, says the text, to carry on the work of evangelization,

> As for them [Jesuits] they have taken care of their affairs in such a manner as to forestall any objection on that score, *for I find in the manuscript memoir that they own in that country* [New France] *eight thousand seven hundred leagues of land.*[24]

Before ascertaining the truth of the statement giving the Jesuits combined tracts of land larger than the State of Illinois—a statement found in a paper said by Parkman to be of "unquestionable historical value,"[25]—the memoir spoken of by the reporter has to be found. There will be in the *Récit* other allusions of the mysterious, well-informed memoir. Margry did not think of everything; he did not want to 'mutilate' this "remarkable memoir"[26] more than he could help; nor, to be sure, did he wish to attribute to La Salle statements which the explorer could not possibly have made.

---

[24] AN, 1232, n. 1:31; Margry, I, 363.

The *Récit* then which was supposed to be made up of conversations its author had with La Salle turns out to be merely the concoction by some individual who put together a few passages culled from some books he may have read on the manners of the North American Indians, who used the so-called memoir of Talon of 1667, that of Bernou of 1678, and another "memoir" spoken of in the above passage suppressed by Margry. Our reporter had this memoir before his eyes when he wrote the *Récit*. In the Archives Nationales, it follows immediately upon the *Récit,* and the pagination of the whole document is continuous. Margry's mangled printed version stopped with page 98; the whole document continues twelve pages more to page 110. Margry knew better than to publish the *Récit* as he found it, knew better than to publish the whole document, for it shows beyond question the so-called interviews to be fictitious. It is not hereby meant that La Salle did not give interviews, did not hold conversations, did not speak of the Indians, of their manners, of their customs, for there are extant notes taken after a conversation on these subjects with La Salle.[27] But what is here denied is that the ten or twelve conversations spoken of by the author of the *Récit* ever took place. The real interviews of La Salle suggested to the author of the *Récit* the form he would give to his mendacious, worthless account.

Later in the *Récit,* Margry suppressed whole pages, because it was too evident, even to Margry, that La Salle could not possibly have spoken in such a manner, and because he did not want the reader to catch the reporter contradicting himself. It is really an amazing thing that Margry after all this rigging, had still the effrontery to speak of his love for truth, of his impartiality, of his serene objectivity.[28] Margry's career among manuscripts, as Winsor said, is truly remarkable, and his editing of the La Salle papers is on a par with his earlier adventures in the historical field. And most amazing of all, the printing of such worthless material was financed with public money. Parkman himself, through whose exertions the printing was made possible, was forced to discard altogether the evidence in this "most curious monument," pertaining to Mississippi exploration. Did Parkman fail to see Margry's deceit? Perhaps not, for in Chapter VII of his *La Salle,* the American is strenuously trying to persuade himself and his readers of the unquestionable historical value of the document. If Parkman had been more familiar with the productions of the French Jansenist pamphleteers of the seventeenth century, he would have recognized in the *Récit* the trade-mark of the sect. This lampoon does not mirror "the jealousies and enmities that beset the path of the discoverer,"[29] but it merely reflects the partisan feeling of some member of the Jansenist party. Margry had undoubtedly recognized the worthlessness of the document from a historical point of view, especially with regard to the history of the exploration of the Mississippi, since, in his third volume, he described the *Récit*: "One of several memoirs in a thick copybook after the manner of Arnauld's work entitled *Morale*

---

[25] *La Salle,* 96.

[26] *Ibid.,* 107.

[27] *The Canadian Historical Review,* XVIII, 1937, 167-177. Cf. *ibid.,* 174, and Margry, I, 353.

---

[28] Cf. Margry, I, xxiv.

[29] *La Salle,* 117. After quoting a few passages from Le Tac, cf. *infra,* Margry, V, cx, repeated apropos of the *Histoire chronologique* what Parkman wrote about the *Récit.* Le Tac, we are told, shows the "partis en présence" during the two terms of Frontenac as governor. As a matter of fact, Le Tac's book is on a par with the *Récit.* Parkman wavered in his appraisal of the trustworthiness of the *Récit*; in an earlier edition of his *La Salle,* he had ended the chapter thus: "Here ends this remarkable memoir; which, criticize it as we may, undoubtedly contains a great deal of truth," *The Discovery of the Great West,* Boston, 1871, 113. Where this "great deal of truth" is to be found was never said.

pratique des Jésuites."[30] No serious student would ever go to such a source for his material, that is, if he were interested in history and not in fiction. But, as was said previously, the compiler had very strong motives of his own for publishing it anyway, and for publishing it after mutilating it.

The memoir used as one of the sources of the *Récit* is entitled *Memoire de la conduite des Jesuites en Canada.*[31] It is divided into four sections dealing respectively with the confessional, marriages, the brandy trade, and preaching. Any man so belaboring the truth does not sign his prose, but internal evidence leads toward a beginning of identification, although the present writer has been unable to give a definite name to its author.

The first division deals with the wholesale violation of the confessional secret by the Canadian priests in general and by the Jesuits in particular. The memorialist singles out Father Chastelain as the principal Jesuit offender in this matter. Father Dablon is said to have urged a man called Langevin to lie to the judges. Langevin is made to give Dablon a lesson in elementary ethics, and, we are told, the accused reported everything to our memorialist, who names the two condemned men and specifies the date, August 28, 1667, when the capital sentence was carried out against Langevin's accomplice, a soldier called Champagne. It appears strange that a death sentence should be carried out the day Tracy embarked for France,[32] and it is curious that a man should be condemned to death when there was no meeting of the Sovereign Council. A man was condemned to death for desertion on June 2, but there was no such salacious story connected with it as our memorialist contends, nor are the names of the so-accused mentioned in this capital sentence in any way similar to those set down in the memoir.[33]

---

[30] Margry, III, 626. The manuscript in the hand of a copyist has no general title. The first part lacks a sub-title and comprises 56 pages; the second, 57-99, bears the sub-title "Histoire de M^r de la Salle"; the third, 99-111, is the basic "Memoire de la conduite des Jesuites en Canada," AN, K 1232:n. 1.

[31] AN, K 1232, n. 1:99-111, in Margry's copy, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 9288:38-40.

[32] *Journal des Jésuites,* 356.

[33] *Jugements et délibérations,* I, 397.

The memorialist really takes to Jesuit-baiting with a vim. Next we are told that "they" force people to go to confession "in the middle of the fields, in the streets, in the houses without any previous examination of conscience; they merely tell the people: 'Just stay where you are, I'll hear your confession.' " "They" are then specified. There is M. Morel, the parish priest of Beauport, who revealed knowledge gained in confession from the pulpit. Father Chastelain spoke in public of what he knew of the confession of Governor Courcelle. There are fifteen or sixteen depositions dealing with the breaking of the sacramental secret in the hands of M. Talon. "His prudence will dictate to him when and where to make these depositions public. Their contents make one's hair stand up." Until now the memorialist has not yet revealed his identity, but the next paragraph gives the first indication as to who he is.

> On that account [the wholesale revelations] M. de Courcelle is asking *me* for a priest with power to absolve and he will not go to confession until I send him one. Many other inhabitants cry for mercy and loudly say that they have no freedom of conscience, even the poor nuns whose confession I heard at the time of the last jubilee. Although the nuns must have an extraordinary confessor every three months, they can never obtain one, for the bishop, who is an out and out Jesuit, always refuses them one.

This indicates that the memorialist was a priest, who seems to have had other priests under him. More information is found in the next paragraph: "In a word everybody cries for freedom of conscience. I shall prove this to you by the testimony of the Public Prosecutor [M. le lieutenant général criminel et civil] of Quebec, who came hither with us from that country."

The second division of the anonymous memoir used by the author of the *Récit,* deals with marriages. After having accused the clergy of Canada and the Jesuits of the most heinous crime a priest can commit, he proceeds to give examples of how Jesuits and diocesan priests simply break marriages, how they favor divorces, and allow bigamy right and left. He seems to have been obsessed by the number one hundred. One hundred persons in Canada will testify that confessions are revealed. M. Patoulet, Talon's secretary, was himself refused the absolution one hundred times; Morel, the parish priest of Beauport, dissolves marriages, grants divorces for one hundred *pistoles,* and with regard to bigamy, "M. Chartier, the Quebec Public Prosecutor, knows one hundred of such cases. He is here in this city, very much persecuted by the Jesuits, because he always blamed their foolishness, and because being an honorable man, he never wanted to be a member of their cabal." The next four paragraphs contain a tirade against the *Sainte-Famille,* where allusion is made to the difficulties which arose in 1667, between Laval and Talon.

The third division of the memoir which deals with the brandy trade and the trade of the Jesuits is here translated in full:

> Although His Majesty only allowed brandy this year, that is, freedom to sell brandy to all sorts of persons, nevertheless the bishop, a Jesuit to the core, loudly asserted that the king could not and ought not give this permission. M. Talon as well as I heard the said bishop say this; the said bishop cares nothing for the orders of the king when they go counter to the wishes of the Jesuits.
>
> All the creatures of the Jesuits have at all times covertly sold brandy to the Indians, although it was then forbidden, and they themselves [Jesuits] are selling brandy to the Indians day and night for their beaver pelts. That is the reason why they discharged one of their servants, Robert by name, because he made known that they were selling brandy day and night.
>
> Father Albanel sold at the Cap [de la Madeleine] for 700 *pistoles* of moose and beaver skins; he himself told it to me in 1667. He is selling bread, wine, wheat, bacon, and he is running a shop at the Cap, just as in Quebec Brother Joseph is selling all kinds of merchandises. What scandalizes everybody is that this brother makes a profit of 500% on everything he sells.
>
> The Jesuits are engaged in the brandy as well as in all other trades. They do everything they please. They possess all that is best in land, the woods they own are the finest, the most extensive, their land the most fertile. In a word, they have eight thousand seven hundred leagues of land in that country. They are

all powerful, and the king is but a small land owner [petit seigneur] in comparison with them.

Previously, they excommunicated those who sold brandy to the Indians, while they themselves were selling it.

They built their college partly with the money from their trade, and partly with money borrowed from the population. The 10% tax is now being paid to clear the latter debt. And all this to build their college which costs 400,000 livres; they said that it was for the bishop. Everybody is complaining about it now. Their garden eight hundred steps long is made of filled in land.

Beside all this information about the trade of the Jesuits, something more is learned about the memorialist himself. He was a man moving in governmental circles. He heard the protests of Laval against the ordinance of November 1668.

The last division of the memoir adds a last stroke to the pen picture the author drew of himself. The first three paragraphs deal with a sermon preached by Father Pardy [Bardy] March 12, 1666. The Jesuit is said to have insulted Courcelle and Talon from the pulpit, calling them "pumpkins born in the night," perturbers of the public peace.[34] In a sermon at Three Rivers, Father Albanel said that "the priests sent by Abbés de Queylus and de Bretonvilliers were Jansenists and priests of the Antichrist." In another sermon at Three Rivers, the same preacher had asserted that all the secular priests were drunkards and debauchees. "I say nothing of the calumny against me, of my so-called drunkenness, for M. Talon will tell you how my innocence triumphed over their false calumnies."

The attempt at identification of the author of this memoir is to be made from internal evidence alone, for the whole document is in the handwriting of a copyist, and from its neatness and carry-over words at the foot of the pages, it was evidently ready for publication. Another question has to be disposed of at the outset. Did the author of the *Récit* make a faithful copy of the memoir reproduced at the end of the first two parts of his composition? The answer seems to be affirmative, because in the *Récit* where all this was to reappear, the author felt that he had to tone down some statements which appeared impossible even to him.

---

[34] Margry cut this passage out of the *Récit*. He used it in his introduction to volume V, cxi.

If we gather up the data supplied by internal criticism, we find that the author of the memoir was a priest with some sort of superiorship. He had been in Canada, was in Quebec in 1666, went up the St. Lawrence, stopped at the Cap de la Madeleine in 1667, and wrote his memoir in Paris at the beginning of 1669. He seemed to have returned to France with Talon 1668 while Courcelle remained in Canada. He asserts that he crossed over to France with M. Chartier de Lotbinière, the Public Prosecutor of Quebec.

Since internal evidence shows beyond doubt that every event narrated or alluded to took place during Talon's first term of office, and since there are so many traits of the memorialist, it would seem at first blush easy to identify him. The difficulty is that these traits do not fit one man, one priest. From internal evidence again, the memorialist was most likely a priest of St. Sulpice—the Sulpicians alone are not censured—Margry saw this: and the silence of Faillon seems to indicate that he too thought that the author of the memoir was one of his confrères. It is known for certain that prominent Sulpicians crossed over to France three times. The Abbé de Queylus a priest with authority over other priests went to France with the Quebec Public Prosecutor, but they embarked in October 1659, which is nearly ten years too early to fit in with the rest of the traits of the memorialist.[35] Another Sulpician with authority, M. Souart, went to France in 1667,[36] but M. de Lotbinière did not cross the Atlantic that year.[37] Nor did the prosecuting attorney go to France in the fall of 1671, when M. de Queylus, d'Allet, and de Galinée returned definitely to the mother country.[38] And there is not one shred of evidence proving that any of these Sulpicians was ever accused of drunkenness. Persistent and diligent search of the records, printed and manuscript, yielded nothing. Perhaps some other student will be more successful in identifying the author of the memoir.

---

[35] *Journal des Jésuites,* 267.

[36] Dollier to Casson, *Histoire du Montréal,* 109.

[37] M. P.-G. Roy was consulted about the voyages of M. de Lotbinière, and kindly answered that the Prosecuting Attorney went to Paris in 1679. The records in Quebec show that he was in the colony in 1668, 1670, and 1671.

[38] Dollier de Casson, *Histoire du Montréal,* 116. Margry wrote in pencil "Tronson?" on the first page of his copy of the *Memoire,* BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 9288-38, as though the Superior of the Sulpician were perhaps the author of the lampoon. It is a gratuitous insult to the memory of the saintly Sulpician.

The memorialist rather had the Jesuits caught on the charge of violating the secrecy of the confessional; they were put at a very grave disadvantage. Take Father Chastelain, for instance, accused of making public what he heard in confession from Governor Courcelle. If he had known the foul accusation and particularizing had answered it in his defense, he might easily work harm to the sacrament of penance; hence it was possible for him to answer only in general terms, which would prove a weak defense; if he kept silence, there were some capable of supposing this an admission of guilt.

The whole of Talon's correspondence about the fifteen or sixteen depositions he possessed is devoid of any remark about confessional violations even though he several times refers to the *"gehenne"* of consciences. The bigamy business is more stupid still. Then as now it was a crime against the civil law, yet the Public Prosecutor of Quebec, who knew "one hundred" such offenses, did not pursue the offenders. The Jesuits are not only trading in all kinds of merchandises, but in brandy as well, day and night, at the Cap de la Madeleine and in Quebec. And Talon, who is in Quebec, who sees this brandy trade going on under his very eyes, whose brandy policy was opposed by Laval and the Jesuits, Talon does not object? The evidence reveals the colossal bias of the memorialist rather than the guilt of the accused.

The next two items of the memoir reveal its author as a case for psychopathic investigation. The Jesuits, he said, own 8,700 leagues, that is, square leagues of land in Canada. Taken roughly (seven square miles [2.7 x 2.7] to the square league), this is an area of 60,900 square miles, equivalent to the area of the States of Illinois and Connecticut combined, nearly thirty-nine million acres! There are fortunately two official documents pertaining to the land bought by or granted to the missionaries about the time when our memorialist was thus deeding them a kingdom.

The first is a copy of the declaration made to the intendant in October 1663, a few years before the memorialist's generous concessions. An ironical fate placed this copy of the declaration of land possessed by the Jesuits in the same file of the French Archives as the memoir.[39] Without entering into a long analysis of this document, suffice it to say there were two kinds of land grants, those of cultivated land, and those not yet cleared, because nobody had asked for them. Near Quebec 300 people were living on the 16,000 acres of land that had been granted to or bought by the Jesuits, and a great part of the huge tract of 150,000 acres near Three Rivers had also been sublet to settlers, who were paying an insignificant rent. Much vaster were the lands "which were not yet of value, and which were not yet cleared for lack of *habitants*," forming an area of more than 250,000 acres. The total land possessions of the Jesuits in Canada at that time amounted in round numbers to 500,000, quite a difference from the memorialist's *thirty-nine million acres*. And Talon did not grant the Jesuits the 38,500,000 acres they lacked to make these possessions agree with what the memorialist wrote. A decade after the date of the memoir, another official document, the decree of amortization, recognized as owned by the Jesuits less than 500,000 acres.[40] The memorialist took a rather expansive view of things, it would appear.

The other paragraph in the memoir brings out other elements of rashness in the memorialist's character. We are told that the 10% tax was levied to pay the debts contracted by the Jesuits when building their college. But the proceeds of this tax went to liquidate the debts contracted by the *communauté des habitants*. The tax was a custom duty levied on all merchandise entering Canada.[41] To say the colonists were complaining of this tax because they thus had to pay the debts of the Jesuits is a clear indication of the type of person the memorialist was.

---

[39] AN, K 1232, n. 40, printed in *Jesuit Relations*, 47, 258-271. The *Récit* of which the memoir is an integral part is AN, K 1232, n. 1.

[40] Amortissement pour les jesuites de Canada, AC, B 7:175v-179; *Edits*, I, 102.

[41] Cf. origin and development of this tax in *Jean Talon*, 263; see the contract for the collection of this tax, BRH, XXXIII, 1927, 125.

It is, of course, impossible to find out what, if anything, Father Albanel said to the memorialist in 1667, but after so many flagrantly false assertions, it would be rash to accept what is said about the trade of this Jesuit at Three Rivers with no other evidence than the word of our memorialist.

Finally, we are told that Talon and Courcelle were publicly insulted on March 12, 1666, were called pumpkins and threatened with demotion unless they mended their ways. Yet in November of that year, the intendant wrote his eulogistic letter, quoted above, to the General of the Jesuits. The memorialist could not have been more unfortunate in his examples. On March 12, 1666, Courcelle was not in Quebec; he returned on the seventeenth of that month,[42] and, horrible to relate, less than three weeks after the said insulting sermon, we find him going on a pilgrimage to Ste. Anne with the very Jesuit, Father Bardy, who had so grievously flayed him from the pulpit.[43] It would be unkind to re-quote here the passage in which the memorialist refers to his "so-called drunkenness" and innocence triumphant.

Out of such testimony was gathered proof of the trade of the Jesuits, of their ambition, and vindictiveness.[44] Incidentally, those who made use of this testimony which they took from the *Récit* have remarked that all said therein might not be altogether true,[45] but after paying this lip service to historical criticism, quotations from and references to this "most curious monument" are given to corroborate groundless theories.[46] These writers, however, with the exception of Faillon and Margry, were handicapped. They only knew the garbled printed version, but Lorin could easily have consulted the "document" in the Archives Nationales, when he was writing his doctoral thesis. It is difficult to follow the reasoning of Eastman with regard to the contents of the *Récit*. Taking for granted that La Salle is the author of the statements about the trade of the Jesuits, he wrote: "The accusations formulated by La Salle himself are extremely direct, and some substantially just."[47] It would have helped if the specific La Salle accusations had been given. On the next page, Eastman wrote:

---

[42] *Journal des Jésuites,* 342.

[43] *Ibid.,* 343.

[44] See Faillon's comments on the alleged sermon of Father Albanel at Three Rivers, II, 487-488.

[45] Parkman, *La Salle,* 107; *Old Régime,* 325; Sulte, V, 41; Lorin, 168, 172.

[46] Parkman, *Old Régime,* 329, 351; Lorin, 197. It has long been known that Gravier was devoid of all critical sense; what he wrote about the genuineness, the trustworthiness of the *Récit* is an added proof of his deficiencies, if such proof were needed, *Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen,* Paris, 1871, 50.

> In most of La Salle's accusations there was palpable exaggeration and gross misrepresentation, but there was other evidence. In his memoir of 1671, Dumesnil had stated that a clerk whom the bishop and Father Ragueneau hired to trade for them bought furs from the Indians with liquors and that for a time the clergy had a monopoly of this traffic. Had this charge been well founded the commerce in question could hardly have escaped the keen eyes of Talon.[48]

This is very true, and it is an answer which those who hold the traffic theory prefer to ignore. But if the brandy traffic asserted in the *Récit* had been well founded in Eastman's mistaken supposition that La Salle had reported the same to Paris, would it have escaped the keen eyes of Frontenac? It is somewhat surprising to find the accusations found in the *Récit* and those found in Dumesnil mutually supporting each other.

Having ascertained the main source used by the friend of Galinée, the last part of the *Récit* can be quickly examined. In the first paragraph, the reporter, beginning to speak of the state of the Christian religion in New France, goes promptly to the reserved case. The Jesuits caused the bishop to promulgate the measure, wrote the author of the *Récit,* and yet they themselves sell brandy to the Indians; "although they hide their brandy trade, M. de la Salle contends that it none the less exists; that besides its being well known, he has unimpeachable proofs of it; that he caught the Jesuits in the act of carrying on the traffic, while they had set trap to catch him at it." One cannot check such testimony as "it is well known" and "all say," and the like. What M. de la Salle's proofs were will be seen below. Contrary to what is asserted above, La Salle never produced the unimpeachable proofs. Nor did he say where he had caught the Jesuits selling brandy to the Indians. It was certainly not at Fort Frontenac, nor in the Iroquois country. In 1678, he had not been farther west than Lake Ontario; he had not even approached the Jesuit Western missions. The "traps" were not set by the Jesuits, but by La Salle himself at a later date. Having no evidence of the Jesuit trade, he resorted to a method, currently known as "framing," in order to compromise the Jesuit missionaries in the West.

---

[47] Eastman, 176.

[48] Eastman refers to *Old Régime,* ch. xxi. This question, in the edition used, is treated in ch. xviii; on p. 325, note 2, specific instances are given from Dumesnil's memoir and from the *Récit*; Parkman added: "I give these assertions as I find them and for what they are worth." In passing it may be said that to neglect criticizing the sources used is an unusual way of writing history.

It is a far from pleasant task to tear off the mask of individuals who have left records not so much of the progress of the exploration, colonization, and civilization in the valleys of the St. Lawrence and of the Mississippi, as of their personal spleen. But too much has been written to extoll such individuals at the expense of others who stood between these "colonizers" and the Indians. Whatever these "explorers" said or wrote has been accepted practically without question and mainly because they belonged to the camp opposed to the Jesuits. One might, it seems, differ from the missionaries' point of view, their aim, and be out of sympathy with their ideal, their purpose and with the means adopted to achieve it, and yet do them justice insofar as their motives were concerned. Their method of colonization was criticized in their day because it clashed with the method favored by merchants and peddlers whose motive was financial gain; and while it is not difficult to understand that these rapacious hawkers of fire-water would besmirch the motives of the missionaries, it is difficult to understand why reputedly objective historians merely echo accusations and recriminations. After all, seventeenth century New France was a hot bed of hatred, of spite, of meanness, of jealousy, the like of which it would be difficult to match anywhere else during any given period. Statements found in documents hatched in such a milieu have been accepted uncritically, have been imposed upon people as the truth, have been used to round out a glorified picture of an inglorious scene.

In the *Récit,* after reporting La Salle's general accusation about the trade of the Jesuits, the narrator continues: "Here is what I find on that trade in a memoir which was given me and which was composed when M. Talon, intendant of Canada, came back to France [1668]." This is the memoir discussed at length in the preceding pages. The friend of Galinée transcribed what he found on the brandy trade, on the trade carried on at the Cap de la Madeleine by Father Albanel, on the 400,000 livres for the college, on the 10% tax levied on the colonists to clear the debts of the Jesuits. The last item argues an ignorance of the financial affairs of Canada as great as the reporter's ignorance of the geography of New France, when the time came to plot La Salle's journey and the "discovery" of the Mississippi in 1671. The 10% tax, the same which was levied when the memorialist wrote, was also levied under Frontenac, at least until 1674.[49] It does not seem that the reporter knew of this, for to imply that Frontenac would levy a tax to pay the debts incurred by the Jesuits is simply foolish.

Our reporter next passes to Frontenac's time. He certainly had access to Bernou's memoir of 1678. The protests of the Jesuits against the rumor that they were making 20,000 livres profit a year, when they only made 4,000 livres are cited. In Bernou's composition, as was noted, the name of "one of them" who had sent such a confession, was not given. In the *Récit* the guilty man is named; he is Father Frémin, the Superior of La Prairie de la Madeleine. Messrs. Frontenac and La Salle had very special reasons for accusing this missionary. He, we are told, answered the governor's expostulations about the traffic "with a note which has been preserved [que l'*on* a conservé] and of which I could have had a copy if I had asked for it." This is another example of the disappearance of the proofs spoken of previously and it will be met again at the end of the most curious monument under consideration. It is a pity that a man so eager as the author of the *Récit* to prove the trade of the Jesuits should have missed the opportunity to secure a copy of such a compromising letter.

---

[49] Cf. Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673; Colbert to Frontenac, May 17, 1674; Frontenac to Colbert, November 14, 1674, in RAPQ, 1927, 48, 59, 64.

Next comes an enlivening touch, the treasonable dealings of the Jesuit missionaries with Andros. It was seen how in Bernou's memoir, Frontenac vaguely refers to these, claiming that he was sending proofs which Bernou did not see fit to transcribe. In the *Récit,* the story is more interesting, more "convincing," since the author invents a little tale about an unrecorded trip of Father Bruyas to New York at some indefinite, unspecified time. To add verisimilitude, a dialogue is reported as having taken place. Doubtless La Salle was either present or eavesdropping, in order so faithfully to recount all that took place during the interview between Andros and Bruyas to the friend of Galinée, who in turn wrote everything down. The means used by Andros to convict the Jesuits of trade is indicated. Lest there might still be some doubt lingering in the reader's mind, the reporter says: "We have [*on a*] this bill of lading," to prove the Jesuits engaged in trade. Very curiously, with the bill of lading in existence, the name of the ship is unknown.[50]

The Andros affair disposed of, the reporter turns his attention to the West, to the Jesuit Missions of Sault Ste. Marie and Michilimackinac, repeating what is found in Bernou's memoir, but adding some disfigurements for good measure. Brébeuf, Garnier, and other Jesuits were not killed by the Iroquois in hatred of the faith; they died fighting, gun in hand. The shooting of the Sioux ambassadors is narrated in great detail. One would almost believe that the reporter was there. However, one detail is omitted, the name of the second Indian tribe "escaped me." An altogether regrettable lapse in one who took such care to jot down all such names as soon as La Salle had spoken them. To defeat the Indians, the French had the alternative of firing the cannon or burning the church, but the Jesuits were opposed to the latter because "their beaver pelts were between the roof and the ceiling of the chapel." La Salle at this time had not gone West, he could not have seen these pelts, but this detail was to be repeated in one of the explorer's letters three years later.

---

[50] The manuscript has "un vaisseau nommé tel," (a ship called so and so), AN, K 1232:36; Margry's copy has the same, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 9288:24, but he printed it thus: "un vaisseau nommé ***," I, 365.

The Jesuits were accused of being more interested in converting beavers than Indians. The reporter supplies proof for this by saying the missionaries abandon the mission posts when the merchants go and when only Indians are left. A curious little apologue accompanies this "curious monument" of unquestionable historical value. It is said, "At times, the memoir is fully sustained by contemporary evidence, but often, again, it rests on its own unsupported authority."[51] Enough has been said about those passages which rest on the sole authority of the reporter or of the memorialist copied by the reporter. Each one of their statements which could be checked proved either to be wholly false or wilfully distorted. The statements "sustained by contemporary evidence," are generalizations, for instance, the fact that the Recollects were protected by Frontenac, and that the governor was irked by the union existing between the Jesuits and the diocesan clergy. These facts were public property, and they are not corroborated because they are also found in the *Récit*; nor is the trustworthiness of the *Récit* increased because these true but general facts are found therein; nor can one speak of confirmation when the author of the *Récit* copies Bernou's memoir of 1678. The particular statement that the missionaries "abandon" the Indians when the traders leave the territory might seem to be "sustained by contemporary evidence," since it is also found in a book published under the name of Christian Le Clercq.[52] This confirmatory proof is found in Chapter XV, which was most probably written by a member of the "party," a close friend of the author of the *Récit,* if the two lampoons, Le Clercq's book and the *Récit,* were not written by the same individual.

---

[51] Parkman, *La Salle,* 96.

[52] Le Clercq, I, 104. Hennepin, *New Discovery,* III, 545, copied Le Clercq verbatim, and added some personal touches. To do away with any doubts about the truth of the abandonment of the Indians by the Jesuits when pelts became scarce, Hennepin says he was there and heard the complaints made by the natives to Frontenac.

Thus far the author of the *Récit* has given little information about himself. He was a friend of Galinée; he met La Salle and was satisfied to play the humble rôle of reporter. He was also a Jansenist and a friend of Arnauld. How close a friend of Arnauld is shown by the next paragraphs of the *Récit*. We are told the Jesuits in Canada do not tolerate the presence of other missionaries in the colony, and for this reason they opposed M. de Queylus and his confreres, whom the Jesuits call Jansenists, although nobody is more opposed to the sect than the Sulpicians. M. de Queylus was so affected by all the injustices done him by the Jesuits while he was in Canada, "that one day having a talk with M. Arnauld on the occasion of a little pilgrimage the latter made to Mont Valérien, where M. de Queylus had retired, he complained to him [Arnauld] about the Jesuits, and said about them as much as Port-Royal could say," which, we may add, would not be little. It is more than a coincidence to find this interview between Queylus and Arnauld also narrated in a chapter of Arnauld's book, the *Morale pratique.* The tenth chapter deals with the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France.* Le Clercq's book indeed was certainly tampered with by a member of the party, and Arnauld's comments supposedly made on the Recollect's statements, are merely an amplification by the leader of the sect of what one of the members had inserted in the book. Le Clercq speaks of the "opposition made to him [M. de Queylus] on all sides both in France and in Canada."[53] Whence came such opposition, asks Arnauld? He answers his own question by saying that it can only come from "influential persons in both Frances," the new and the old, namely, from the Jesuits.

> But however strong are those conjectures of mine; I have no need of them. I know all that is to be known on this affair from the very mouth of that pious abbé, although I saw him only once in my life. I had gone with two of my friends to see the Bishop of Pamiers at Mont Valérien. The Abbé de Queylus was

---

[53] Le Clercq, II, 20.

> living there at the time. They told him that I was there. Taking me aside, we strolled in the garden for quite a long time, and he opened his heart to me on the conduct of the Jesuits of Canada, and everywhere else. The gentlemen of St. Sulpice know well what he told me about the conduct of the Jesuits, and I am sure that they will not say that I considered lies what M. de Queylus said about the Jesuits.[54]

These two quotations clearly show that both Arnauld and the author of the *Récit* are speaking of the same interview between Arnauld and de Queylus. Arnauld states that he only saw Queylus once in his life. In his voluminous works, Arnauld never mentions what he heard from the Sulpician, very likely because the abbé said nothing of a nature capable of being twisted into an attack on the Jesuits; otherwise, we may rest assured, the chief would not have hesitated to repeat these complaints. At some later date, M. d'Allet, also a Sulpician who had been Queylus' secretary in Canada, handed two memoirs to Arnauld, who hastened to print them. Again, if we suppose Queylus to have said something worth while, even if Arnauld had not printed it, he would have mentioned it to his friend, our reporter, the author of the *Récit*. Instead, the latter wrote:

> M. de Galinée, whom I mentioned at the beginning of this relation, although much attached to St. Sulpice and consequently little in favor of those who are called Jansenists, spoke of them in the same manner [as Queylus]. As M. Arnauld only spoke to me in a general way of the complaints of M. de Queylus [against the Jesuits] and as I don't remember the facts in which M. de Galinée grounded his complaints, I'll say no more about it.[55]

The Arnauld-Queylus interview is followed in the *Récit* by a repetition of what is found in Bernou's memoir of 1678, plus a few details designed to augment still more the huge yearly income of the bishop. Laval, in order to keep the money for himself, 40,000 livres, "not counting the tithes," (quite an improvement on the 25,000 livres of Bernou), let the inhabitants of Canada die without the sacraments. "He keeps an open shop in his house where even meat and wooden shoes are sold, so that he is very rich, and he is able to have, on a height dominating Quebec, a palace now being built, which when finished will cost from four to five hundred thousand livres." This, it may be noted, was during Frontenac's time. Can one imagine the governor shutting his eyes to such a lucrative trade carried on openly in Quebec by the bishop, his "enemy." Or would La Salle have dared to say this in Paris?

---

[54] *Morale pratique des Jesuites,* VII, 270.
[55] Margry, I, 368.

The narrator then passes to the *Sainte-Famille* association, and copies directly from the memoir. Here Margry omitted two pages from the *Récit*. This suppressed passage contains the story of the condemnation of the men to death in 1667, and in which Father Dablon figured. The reporter himself abbreviated the story as found in the memoir he had before him, but kept the part about the Jesuits and M. Morel favoring bigamy for those "of their faction." He wound up by saying, "M. Chartier, Public Prosecutor of Quebec, knows many such cases."

After these paragraphs are a few lines which give a clue to the identity of the reporter. There is question of the practice followed in the Eastern Church with regard to confessions. Considering that the reporter knew La Salle, was a Jansenist, a friend of Arnauld, and had access to the Bernou's memoir and to the so-called memoir of Talon of 1667, one may point to Eusèbe Renaudot. Later in the *Récit,* Margry has a note to the effect that he believed the abbé to be the author of the document, and for once one can agree with Margry.[56] But in spite of this isolated instance of harmony with Margry, it is not possible to come to anything more than high probability. If the *Récit* was not written by Renaudot himself, it certainly was inspired by him. Margry did not print the whole passage about confessions in the Eastern Church. Here too the reporter is selecting from the memoir he was copying; he evidently did not believe that the priests of Canada were violating the sacramental secret, no more than Bernou did when he copied the letter of Frontenac of 1677.[57] In the lines omitted by Margry, it is said that a man in possession of such secrets can make himself redoubtable, "when he takes the liberty to speak of them according as his own interests require it. *This is what the Jesuits are accused of doing,* and *it is said* that M. Talon has in his hands fifteen or sixteen depositions of revelations [of confessions] which contain things to make one's hair stand up."

---

[56] *Ibid.,* 392. In the introduction, xxi, to his first volume he had likewise given Renaudot as the author; cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 23.

[57] BN, Clairambault, 1016:45v.

As for the preaching, "the Jesuits do it with impunity against those who displease them. M. de la Salle told me horrible examples which I do not remember well enough, but here is what I find in a memoir which was handed to me and which had been written when M. de Courcelle, governor, and M. Talon, intendant, came back to France," (1672). The author of the *Récit* was not bothered very much with chronology. Shortly before this same memoir had been written in 1668; now, it has been written at the end of 1672. How does it happen that those "horrible examples" mentioned by La Salle are so conveniently forgotten after the great pains taken to commit to writing what the explorer had said? Margry here too "amended" the text of the manuscript. Intending to use this passage in his introduction to volume five, where he gives the reference to the memoir, he did not want to make the said memoir stand out too clearly as the basis of the *Récit*. The reporter, however, had to explain what became of those fifteen or sixteen depositions in the hands of Talon. When the intendant returned to France "he spoke so frankly that the Court gave him to understand they did not want to know all that." Talon had not to speak; he had only to hand in the famous fifteen or sixteen depositions. We recall how high the intendant stood with Colbert. If he had come with these depositions to Paris, with accusations against the Jesuits violating the sacramental secret, and promoting bigamy, Colbert would have started the wheels of justice, or at least would have had Frontenac weary investigating the hundred cases of bigamy.

After a paragraph which reproduces the accusations of Father Albanel against the Sulpicians, taken verbatim from the memoir, the reporter pursuing his trouble-making ways launches into a very much disputed question of his day, the conversion of the Indians. La Salle is instanced as preventing Jesuits from baptizing Indians little disposed to receive the sacrament, just as if the merchant La Salle were endowed with some episcopal authority to determine whether the natives were prepared or not. The first part of the *Récit* ends with a flourish: the *Jesuit Relations* ceased to be published because they contained many falsehoods.

The second part of this monument has for its direct object La Salle, his "history." The opening paragraphs were examined elsewhere. In the discussion referred to, a point was made, namely, "Incidents that happened before the departure of the expedition of 1669 as narrated by Galinée were so disfigured that no one will be accused of maligning the author in asserting that he was determined to be inaccurate, or, in plainer English that he wilfully lied."[58]

The detailed analysis of the remarkable memoir has revealed its character and the character of the author, as well as traits of the author of the memoir used by the reporter. Items pertaining to La Salle may be considered briefly. The name of the missionary at an Indian village to which La Salle is said to have gone, is forgotten by the scribe. La Salle made no journey to the Mississippi in 1671, and so there is no call for discussion on this point. The story of the attempted seduction of La Salle, found nowhere else, was inserted to enliven the narrative. It can be rejected outright. So may what follows. Jean Cavelier is supposed to have come back from France between 1676 and 1677.[59] La Salle's brother did not leave Canada from 1666 until 1679.[60] The so-called opposition of the Jesuits to the trading post of Cataracouy has been briefly mentioned before. The added details, such as the name of a Jesuit brother, Boquet,[61] are again distortions.

---

[58] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 23-24.

[59] The reason behind this imaginary journey of Jean Cavelier was a scandal in the colony involving his brother, who, it was rumored, had betaken himself to Fort Frontenac with a woman. Abbé Cavelier would have gone to expostulate with his kinsman over the scandal. Cf. Margry, I, 381. This may be the *Récit* version of what Parkman is referring to when he speaks of a "Letter of La Salle in the possession of M. Margry," *La Salle,* 102. For the story see *Mid-America,* XXI, 1939, 298-313.

[60] *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* 4. Cf. Tronson to Lefebvre, April 5, 1677, no. 6, and Tronson to Remy, 1680, no. 99.

Exceedingly nimble wits are portrayed in the next scene. Lemoyne and La Salle are in conversation. An Indian witness who knows no French stands by, and by an art unknown to whites, understands what is said. The Indian wished to accuse the Jesuits, which he did as follows. He took off La Salle's hat, "which was black," and moved it up and down the latter's body, and thus indicated to Frontenac that he had meant the Black Robes! Only persons highly intelligent in Indian ways could know from this lone sign the complete thought of the Red man.

An unlooked for defense of the Jesuits suddenly occurs. La Salle, while in France, had accused them of being the moral cause of a great crime. They had sent one of their emissaries to poison him.[62] But a fragment of one of his letters inserted in the *Récit* clears them of all guilt in this matter.[63] Hence, says the reporter, what La Salle does not retract about the Jesuits is true. As already seen, the accusations of La Salle in the *Récit* have very little that is definite. The reporter "forgot" the specific instances given by the explorer, and he supplied this lapse of memory with some examples from the memoirs he used.

In La Salle's letter, the Fort which Tonty had gone to build,[64] 200 leagues from Quebec, is given a specific purpose.

---

[61] Charles Boquet was not a Jesuit, but a *donné.* There was question of letting him begin his novitiate, *Journal des Jésuites,* 266, but he never took the vows. His name often occurs in the Journal of the Jesuits, cf. *Jesuit Relations,* 62, 273, n. 10. In the census of 1681, he is listed as one of the *donnés* residing at the College of Quebec, Sulte, *Histoire des Canadiens-Français,* V, 53, his age is given as 56. The last mention of Boquet which was seen is in the letter of Lamberville to Frontenac, September 20, 1682, AC, C 11A, 6:47; NYCD, IX, 193; *Jesuit Relations,* 62, 154. He had brought the letter of the governor to the missionary in the Iroquois country.

[62] The Nicolas Perrot, nicknamed Jolycoeur, was not, as Parkman thought, *La Salle,* 104, n. 1, the famous traveler. There is a Joly-Coeur mentioned in the roster of Fort Frontenac, Margry, I, 297.

[63] What is "so honorable" for La Salle to retract a foul calumny he hawked about while in France? *La Salle,* 106. Is it thereby meant that La Salle should not have retracted? To see the hand of his former brethren in everything untoward that happened to him was one of La Salle's weaknesses, cf. *Some La Salle Journeys,* 24, n. 7.

[64] Fort Conti, near Niagara Falls.

This fort, says La Salle—if the fragment is genuine[65]—will be an obstacle to the Jesuits' lucrative intercourse with Mexico. This trade of the Jesuits with Mexico existed only in La Salle's imagination, and the "rather frequent visits" of the Recollects to the Jesuit mission in the Iroquois country existed only in the imagination of our reporter. The "visits" narrow down simply to Hennepin's picnic during the absence of La Salle.[66] The Recollect did not go to the Iroquois country to secure "a few catechisms," but while a guest of Father Bruyas—whose name strangely enough the reporter also forgot—he copied an Iroquois dictionary. All of which is in Bernou's memoir of 1678, and with this at hand one can see how the reporter doctored everything he touched.

An episode having nothing to do with La Salle is noteworthy for its ridiculousness. One Deslauriers wished to go to Cataracouy. He begged a Recollect, Hennepin, to take him. Hennepin, reluctant, asked for a letter from Father Bruyas, the Jesuit missionary among the Iroquois, attesting that he, Hennepin, was acceding to the requests of Bruyas and Deslauriers. The reporter then invents a disaster. Bruyas' letter to the Recollect Superior fell into Hennepin's hands, and in it Hennepin is accused of forcing Deslauriers to go to Cataracouy. Had Hennepin been thus falsely accused, he would have shrieked to the high heavens at the injustice done him by the Jesuit, and his cries would be ringing down the ages in his book of 1683 and certainly in that of 1697. But nothing is said where Hennepin narrates his journey to the Iroquois country.

La Salle is reputed to have come to France in 1677 for two reasons, to defend Frontenac against the calumnies of the Jesuits, and to ask "for letters patent authorising him to establish several colonies in the countries he had discovered." The reporter was a little hasty. In 1678, La Salle had discovered nothing. He had merely roamed over the Iroquois country, and had been following trails blazed by traders and missionaries for half a century previously.

---

[65] That La Salle wrote to Renaudot in 1678 is certain, see BN, Clairambault, 1016:173. Margry, II, 221, garbled some names of addressees, thus he gives *M. Fodard-Renaudot,* for *Monsieur dodart* [,] *Renaudot.* The first name is that of the naturalist who interviewed La Salle in Paris in 1678, cf. *Canadian Historical Review,* XVIII, 1937, 167-168. In the fragment inserted in the *Récit,* there is a stray allusion to "chemical medecine," and a paragraph of excuse for having dwelt so long "on a science about which I know so little." The fragment might well be a mixture of these letters to Renaudot and to Dodart.

[66] The visit of Hennepin to the Seneca, *Description of Louisiana,* 74, and *New Discovery,* 80-88, occurred in the winter of 1678-1679.

> The Jesuits sent to France more than a year ago one of their *donnés* called Jolliet with a map drawn on hearsay. The *donné* attributed to himself the honor of having made this discovery. This imposture did not meet with success and did not turn out to the honor of the *donné,* who, according to all appearances did not answer satisfactorily to the questions asked in similar occurrences. M. Galinée let it be understood to one of my friends that he knew only one man able to make such a discovery: that man is M. de La Salle.

Here the discovery of the Mississippi by M. de la Salle in 1671 is put forward. No comments are necessary. M. de Galinée, who was dead at the time, could be quoted without fear of contradiction. Unfortunately for the reporter, Galinée had left on record what he thought of the capability of La Salle. The young Sulpician was not deceived by the "belles paroles" of the explorer.[67]

The arrival of La Salle in Paris, his difficulties in obtaining an audience with Colbert, his petition to the minister, for the concession of Sault St. Louis are next narrated in the *Récit*. The reason why La Salle wanted this land grant was because "it was certain to block the commerce the Jesuits were carrying on in that country notwithstanding the prohibitions of the Pope and of the king." Amusing is the diligence of La Salle. His concessions, Fort Frontenac, Fort Conti, Sault St. Louis, were asked for always in order to block the trade of the Jesuits. But his motives as regards a foothold at the Sault were, however, somewhat complex in that he had some brandy to sell to the Indians settled near the spot.

While in Paris, it is fairly certain, La Salle in gadding about told his new friends things they wanted to hear about the Jesuits. This, however, was to no practical end unless

---

[67] *Some La Salle Journeys,* 15-16.

Colbert and Louis XIV also heard his indictment. Besides, the author of the *Récit* realized that evidence better than the mere word of a trading adventurer was needed. In other words, some proofs had to be produced or manufactured. Naturally, the reporter would be expected to have seen these proofs. He had said previously that he could have had a copy of Father Frémin's letter virtually admitting that the Jesuits were engaged in trade. Now, with regard to the proofs brought by La Salle, his genius brought forth a documentary concoction, not unlike that invented before in connection with La Salle's expedition on the Mississippi in 1671, when all the witnesses were spirited away, lest one be found to contradict what La Salle chose to say about his "discoveries."

> Besides what M. de la Salle found occasion to tell the minister about the conduct of the Jesuits in Canada and about that of the bishop, who is exercising a cruel inquisition in that country in conformity with the wishes of these Fathers, he had M. Tronson, Superior of the Sulpicians and spiritual director of Colbert, hand in an exact memoir on the conduct of the Jesuits, filled with numerous and circumstantiated details, of which M. de la Salle pledged to give proofs—original papers signed by the Jesuits, an innumerable multitude of witnesses, and public knowledge.
>
> I cannot help saying here with sorrow that he [La Salle] had promised me a copy he had had made of that memoir. But this copy, unbeknown to him, was, instead of his letters patent, put in a box by one of his servants. The servant reached La Rochelle and embarked before the arrival of M. de la Salle, who had hardly time to dismount and board the ship when it sailed.

The interview of La Salle with Colbert took place during the first months of 1678. Even if M. Tronson did not hand to Colbert the "exact memoir," La Salle, according to the *Récit,* said enough to the minister to prompt an investigation into the traffic of the Jesuits, of the bishop, into their wealth, etc. Yet, there is not one word about all these accusations in the letters of Colbert of 1678, nor in those of the following years. Why should La Salle turn in the memoir to Tronson? Why did he not give it to Colbert himself when he spoke to the minister?

The *Récit* ends with a fanciful account of the interview of Dudouyt with Colbert. The author was evidently not aware of the second interview which took place two weeks later at Sceaux.

> M. Colbert ordered M. de la Salle to send the original of a law suit which contains peculiar facts. It seems that the minister wishes at least to have a thorough knowledge of the state of affairs in that country. But, unless the influence the Jesuits have at Court changes, there is little appearance that this knowledge will have any other effect than reprimands in France, which will make no great stir in Canada.

This last paragraph of the *Récit* is absurd. Why should Colbert ask for more proofs, if La Salle had already given so many proofs? The minister was not in the habit of asking adventurers to send the original of a law suit. Which law suit was this? Why, if the law suit was not wholly imaginary, ask for the originals when there were certified copies in the registers of the Sovereign Council? Does the author of the *Récit* wish us to believe that Frontenac, who at this time was keeping the registers in his house, would certify that the official copy was different from the original deeds produced in the law suit, if it was a true copy? Colbert knew all he needed to know. He had the letters of Frontenac, and the so-called information brought by La Salle. All the influence of the Jesuits in France would never have prevented the minister and the king from punishing the Jesuits in Canada, if proofs of trading activities had been sent to Paris. The king especially would not have countenanced such a disobedience to his formal orders, as is seen from the step he took, once he had the proof that Frontenac was disobeying them. Nor would the Jesuits, who had little influence with Colbert, have been able to stay the minister. The point is that in La Salle's time some people wanted to hear certain things against the Jesuits and wanted to believe them. In Margry's time a similar mentality manifested itself, and he himself was ignoble enough to bequeath the chit-chat procedure to an American generation.

This long analysis of the *Récit* has tended to a complete evaluation of its trustworthiness. Langlois and Seignobos would seem to have had in mind these two "remarkable memoirs," the *Récit* and Bernou's composition of 1678, when they wrote their directions for historical criticism:

> It is usual to say of the historian that he "fails in criticism" when he neglects to distinguish between documents, when he never mistrusts traditional ascriptions, and when he accepts, as if afraid to lose a single one, all the pieces of information, ancient or modern, good or bad, which come to him, from whatever quarter.[68]

To have omitted an examination of the *Récit* would have in no way benefitted history. It is by no means intended by these remarks to accuse all who have written upon the history of New France of carelessness in criticizing documents, even though some writers have been so misguided as to accept as authentic sources such contemporary references as "it was said," "rumor had it," and "reports current in the colony." More diligent investigators have consulted contemporary manuscript and printed accounts, some extensively, some casually, for an answer to the question, "Did the Jesuits of New France trade?" Study of the answers of the writers of all classes reveals an astounding confusion of opinions. Some suspend judgment, some avoid the subject, some with or without study answer positively in the affirmative or in the negative, depending upon their bias. The French methodologists may be quoted once more:

> The critical investigation of authorship saves historians from huge blunders. Its results are striking. By eliminating spurious documents, by *detecting false ascriptions,* by *determining the conditions of production of documents* which had been defaced by time, and by *connecting them with their sources,* it has rendered services of such magnitude that today it is regarded as having a special right to the name of "criticism."[69]

We turn now to an inquest into the Jesuit trade question in the West. "La Salle," wrote Parkman, "gives also many particulars especially relating to Michilimackinac, where, as he says, the Jesuits had a large stock of beaver skins."[70] This is an allusion *not* to the accusations supposed to have been made by the explorer and found in the *Récit,* for at that time, 1678, the explorer had not gone near Michilimackinac, but the historian refers to what is contained in La Salle's letters.

---

[68] Langlois and Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History,* G. G. Berry translator, New York, 1898, 98.

[69] *Ibid.* They add in a note: "Nothing amuses the gallery more than to see an historian convicted of having built a theory on falsified documents. Nothing is more calculated to cover an historian with confusion than to find that he has fallen into the error of treating seriously documents which are not documents at all," and in the case of the *Récit,* mere vaporings of propagandists committed to paper.

From 1678, the year of his return to Canada, to 1683, La Salle came in contact with the Jesuits in the West, at Green Bay, Michilimackinac, or the Sault. He mentions the missionaries in his letters during that period, but though insinuations of trade are found in them, there is no direct accusation. In his letter of September 1680, to M. Thouret, one of his business associates, he says, in enumerating his losses, that in the summer of 1679, one of the deserters "stole from me 3,000 livres worth of beaver skins which were deposited at Michilimackinac;" and further down, that the deserters "had stolen beaver skins which I had [deposited] at Michilimackinac."[71] The "large stock of beaver skins" spoken of by Parkman did not all belong to the Jesuits. The Jesuit houses, the attics of their churches, were used by Indians and coureurs de bois to store their pelts,[72] for the simple reason that it was the only safe place in the western wilderness. In another letter of the following year, 1681, La Salle wrote:

> On September 16, I arrived at Sault Ste. Marie, where I had come to take from the house of the Jesuit Fathers the pelts which those same deserters had deposited there. But the good Fathers, unable to elude in any other way the order of M. de Frontenac brought thither by four soldiers, gave me their word as religious, that they did not know which belonged to these men from the other peltries. There were many furs, so many in fact that the attic of their church, a very large attic, was full

---

[70] *Old Régime,* 329. Lorin also tells us, 168, on the word of La Salle, Margry, II, 116, that the missionaries, that is, the Jesuits, had "dans leurs stations principales, de vrais entrepôts, comme celui du Sault-Sainte-Marie."

[71] Margry, II, 67, 70. Compare what is said here by La Salle with the little romance excogitated by the author of the *Récit,* Margry, I, 396.

[72] Cf. La Potherie, *Voyage de l'Amérique,* II, 209.

> of them. They offered to open it for me, so that I could take what I wanted. I replied that I was afraid to be excommunicated for taking church property, if I should inadvertently take their own peltries, which I could not tell apart from mine. I left the following day with nothing done.[73]

The implication here is obvious. The great number of peltries of the Jesuits at the Sault came from trade. La Salle wished his correspondent thus to understand it. Parkman so understood it. If, for the sake of argument, the little dialogue here reported actually took place, the fear of excommunication was a vain fear. If these beaver pelts belonged to the Jesuits, they would have known which were theirs. And if they were bickering traders, they would have known their possessions, and could have prevented La Salle from taking what belonged to them. Moreover, how did La Salle know so many pelts were in the attic of the church? Of his own confession he declined the offer made by the Jesuits to open the doors.

In 1681, La Salle wrote another rambling commercial letter to one of his associates. He speaks of the St. Francis Xavier mission, at the mouth of the Fox River: "There is a house of the Jesuits, who really hold the key to the fur country, where a lay brother and two helpers turn more iron into beaver than the Fathers turn Indians into Christians."[74] Beside being a variant of Frontenac's remark of 1672, La Salle's saying was designed to imply a lively trade in process at the St. Francis Xavier mission. In the same letter, he gratuitously accuses the Jesuits of weaning away his men. The accusation may be passed over without comment in view of what is rather generally known of La Salle's relations with his men. In this letter, he defends his conduct toward his fellow adventurers. In proof of his lenience, he gives by way of example the return of some of the deserters. Among these, Moïse Hilaret, daily regretted having listened

> to the bad advice of those who incited him to do what he did [to desert]. The same is true of two other men who have re-

---

[73] Margry, II, 116.
[74] Margry, II, 251.

turned to their duty. One of them, called Gabriel Minime, was not only persuaded to desert, but to help him in his desertion, an ecclesiastic of this place [Fort Frontenac] lent him merchandises worth fifty crowns, and hid him until he could find the means to leave secretly for the Ottawa country in spite of the orders [forbidding him to go].[75]

The ecclesiastic spoken of here was certainly not a Jesuit, for there is no example of La Salle's letters of his reference to them except "the Fathers," and moreover, La Salle in this betrayal would have very specifically indicated one of them. No Jesuit was at Fort Frontenac until a decade later. The priest in charge at the time was Father Luc Buisset, Recollect, the companion of Hennepin,[76] but again La Salle does not refer to the Recollects as "ecclesiastics;" it may be that by "d'icy" he meant Canada.

The Jesuit brother, Louis Le Bohesme, who at Sault Ste. Marie works as a gunsmith for the Indians, advised him [Gabriel Minime] to hide the merchandises he stole from me in the house of the Jesuits; and in order, said the brother, that I may swear to know nothing about it, put them in my room when I am not there, my child. Another [deserter] called André Hunault, deposited [in the Jesuit house] eight packages of beaver skins, each worth 150 livres. Brother Louis and Father Bailloquet, received an order from Father Nouvel, then Superior, to hand over the said peltries to M. de Tonti, whom I had sent for that purpose, but they counselled this young man [Hunault] to keep two of the packages, which he did. He left the packages in their house. They swore on their word as religious that [the six packages] were all there was. I have a hundred other proofs of the advice given to my men which, if needs be, I shall produce.[77]

These instances do not necessarily imply a Jesuit trading enterprise in the Ottawa country, but they are calculated to leave the impression of Jesuit expertness in pelt dealings. Minime and Hunault, especially the first, as will presently be seen, knew what to say to La Salle to win forgiveness for their desertion.

---

[75] Margry, II, 226. This letter is dated Fort Frontenac, August 22, 1682 [1681], BN, Clairambault, 1016:170-187.

[76] Hennepin, *Description of Louisiana,* 59, 264; *New Discovery,* I, 109, 330; Le Clercq, II, 87.

[77] Margry, II, 226.

The above are the only quotations in La Salle's letters connecting the Jesuits with trade. In these letters, certainly written by him and distinguished from what he is made to say in the *Récit,* La Salle does not once accuse outright his former brethren of being engaged in the traffic, he is satisfied with insinuating it. If the correspondent or the historian puts the worse interpretation on the insinuations, well and good, but La Salle could always defend himself against a libel charge by saying that he did not accuse the Jesuits of trading. If La Salle had any, even slight, concrete evidence which would brand the Jesuits as traffickers in pelts, he would not have hesitated to produce it. Two men who were companions of his gave testimony to his lack of evidence. These are Gabriel Barbier, *alias* Minime, whose repentence for deserting La Salle has been mentioned, and Father Hennepin. Minet's unabridged journal was utilized by de Villiers, who wrote:

> His [La Salle's] hatred against them [Jesuits] went so far, if we believe his companions, as to make him conceive a plan which is simply odious. Barbier told Minet that to take his revenge on the Jesuits, La Salle sent him with another Canadian called Andreussy to trade peltries with the Indians at Michilimackinac. They were to ask the Jesuits to keep their pelts in depot and to give them to the Fathers' servants when these came to Quebec. He [La Salle] would go to Montreal about the time the Jesuits send their men down, and would see to it that they be caught with the goods, [qu'on les feroient surprendre], thus showing to the people how those Fathers were carrying on trade. "But," added Barbier, "the plan did not succeed."[78]

It is not necessary to comment on the odious scheme of the "prince of the French explorers." It is an indubitable proof that the Jesuits were not trading. In his roaming in the Iroquois country and in the Great Lakes region, La Salle had found no evidence whatsoever of guilt and hence his recourse to such a strategem.

There is another instance of La Salle's unmanliness. He wished others than himself to admit a knowledge of the trade which he knew did not exist. Should his wish come true, he could claim to have heard trustworthy people, the Recollects for instance, assert it before witnesses. Beyond the portage from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie, in August 1679, Hennepin wrote:

---

[78] Villiers, M. de, *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle au Golfe du Mexique, 1684-1687,* Paris, 1931, 152.

> While we continu'd there, M. *La Salle* told me, That he understood by some of our Men, that I very much blam'd the Intrigues of some Monks of *Canada* [the Jesuits] with the *Iroquese,* and their Neighbours of *New-York* and *New-Orange*; which oblig'd me in his presence, to tell my Brethren the *Franciscans,* That I perceiv'd M. *la Salle* was minded to surprise me, and oblige me to revile some Persons, whom he represented as Traders and Merchants [the Jesuits]; and then abating somewhat of my Tone, I concluded, That notwithstanding the false Reports that had been made to him, I would entertain a good Opinion of those very Persons [the Jesuits] whom he design'd to make my Enemies; and that I wou'd rather give over our Enterprize than be imposed upon at that rate. This vigorous Answer surpriz'd M. *la Salle,* who told me, That he was persuaded that those who had made him those Reports, were not honest Men.[79]

After two such instances, the insinuations contained in the letters of La Salle about the trade of the Jesuits can be dismissed as malicious attempts at slander. The insinuations, or even positive assertions, if such there were, of an *agent provocateur,* and of one who stooped to underworld methods, are utterly worthless. No unprejudiced court of justice would accept his evidence.

Can we accept these two testimonies? Very little is known about Barbier's trustworthiness, but much is known about Hennepin's lack of it. Yet these two testimonies are independent, are voluntary, are by associates, and point to the same fact regardless of their respective contents. The journal of Minet, where Barbier's words are reported, was not known to Hennepin. Barbier could not know in 1684-1685, what the Recollect would publish twelve years later. There was no collusion between them to malign La Salle in this instance. The convergence of the two reports then leads to one conclusion, the explorer had found no evidence of the trade of the Jesuits and tried to fabricate some.

---

[79] Hennepin, *New Discovery,* I, 104.

SECTION 4. THE TESTIMONY OF HENNEPIN, LE CLERCQ AND LE TAC

It has been often pointed out that Hennepin in his first book, the *Description of Louisiana* makes no mention of the Jesuits except of a compatriot of his, Father Pierson, his skating companion at Michilimackinac. In the *New Discovery,* however, is found a systematic disparagement of the work of evangelization carried on by the Jesuits. The Jesuits had come decidedly into the scope of his frets.[1] Above we have given his rebuke to La Salle, yet in the *New Voyage* published the year after the *New Discovery,* we find Hennepin implying that the Jesuits were engaged in trade. He copied almost verbatim a passage from his confrere Le Clercq, wherein the Jesuits are said to follow the fur traders; abandoning the missions when pelts became scarce.[2] To add an air of verisimilitude, Hennepin said he was present when the Indians complained of the departure of the Jesuit missionaries.

It were indeed too much of a task to collect the passages in which Hennepin contradicts himself. Consideration here is given only to his mention of the Jesuits and their trade. Rescued by Duluth from the clutches of the Indians, Hennepin spent the winter of 1680-1681 at Michilimackinac. In the spring he went to Quebec, and left for France late in 1681 on a fishing boat. Two other missionaries accompanied him, Father George Harel, a brother Recollect, and M. Trouvé, a Sulpician. They landed at Le Hâvre in the beginning of 1682. Among his luggage, Hennepin had a canoe. He had this souvenir painted, had the arms of the king fastened on it, and in this colorful equipage, paddled up the Seine on to Paris.[3] M. Dudouyt thought this picturesque manner of traveling unbecoming two Franciscan missionaries. In his letter to Laval, he noted that M. Trouvé, with more sense of decorum, was "too prudent" to join them. When Hennepin landed at St. Germain, he

---

[1] Cf. Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle,* Paris, 1913, 161 ff., where a few of the texts from the *Nouvelle Decouverte* are brought together.

[2] *New Discovery,* II, 545, and Le Clercq, I, 404.

[3] Of course, for one who had bucked the swift current of the Mississippi River at flood time, who had ascended some 1,700 miles of furious waters at a speed far greater than any Olympic champion was ever able to attain on still water for one mile, to go up the Seine, less than 150 miles, was mere child's play. Cf. "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico, 1680," *Mid-America,* XXI, 1939, 43-76.

> began to retail against you [Laval] against the Jesuits and against M. the Intendant [Duchesneau] all kinds of calumnies and in general all that M. de Frontenac is wont to say and write. This forced me to go a second time to the Father Provincial [of the Recollect Province of St. Denis] asking him to send Father Hennepin back to his own Province [of Artois]. I told the Provincial I had heard what that Father was saying. He [Hennepin] had sixteen letters written by the Jesuits of Canada, he showed them around, published their contents, and pretended that by means of these letters, he would convict the Jesuits of many things, among which that they were engaged in trade [quils faisoient la traitte], that they routed beaver pelts to Holland, that they were the ones who caused the Iroquois to wage war against the Illinois in order to involve M. de la Salle and his men with these [Illinois] Indians. He relied on a letter of Father Dablon, which he pretends is a convincing proof showing that the Jesuits had made the Iroquois wage war on the Indians.

When Dudouyt had first complained to the Provincial about the Recollect's actions in Canada, the Superior had answered that Hennepin was extravagant, that it would be difficult to prevent him from talking, that he knew Hennepin well, that it was not he who sent Hennepin to Canada, and that when he returned, the best thing would be to ship him back to his Province. When Dudouyt came back with fresh complaints about the loquaciousness of the Recollect returned to France, the Provincial had changed his mind. It would be difficult, he said, to send Father Louis back to his Province. M. Colbert would not approve of it, because the Father had to remain in Paris on account "of the discoveries he had made." On Dudouyt's insistance, the Provincial again promised to send Hennepin where he belonged. Since the Provincial was not sending Hennepin away,

> Father Vaultier went to see the Superior and complained of the calumnies the Recollect was spreading against his brethren, and above all he complained that Hennepin was publicizing their [private] letters. He was hawking about a memoir of 52 articles

> wherein he collected all that M. de Frontenac is wont to say against you, against M. the Intendant and against the Jesuits. . . . In spite of all Father Vaultier and I have done, Father Louis is still at St. Germain, although he received an order from his own Provincial to return to his province, and although his own Provincial sent a traveling companion for the journey back. He so skillfully maneuvered especially by means of the friends of M. de Frontenac and of M. de l'Estrade that he is still here. The Recollects here say that they wish he were gone.[4]

These details are in one of the letters of M. Dudouyt to Laval; it has been published by Father Lemay,[5] and he exploited it in an article which appeared subsequently.[6] After quoting from the letter, comments were added which concern the Jesuits and which call for rectification. This letter of Dudouyt, we are told by Lemay, "evokes the whole politico-religious question, and treats of the conduct of the Recollects under Laval." The problems are too vast, too complex, and had too many ramifications for Lemay who confesses he cannot pass a certain judgment on "all the controverted points. Those who are initiated will understand me." Initiated or uninitiated, we do understand, especially in the light of what follows.

> To his eyes [Dudouyt's] nothing is more evident, and no proof is needed: the governor [Frontenac] is wrong all along the line, the bishop and the intendant are right in everything, this does not need to be demonstrated. Consequently the accusations and allegations of Father Hennepin are pure calumnies, as well as are those of M. de Frontenac. This is not how history speaks.[7]

To bolster the last sentence a quotation from Lorin is given, in which the biographer of Frontenac speaks about "two different conceptions of Canadian society." This, we are assured is the only just interpretation, all the others are false, for thus spake history, or better, M. Lorin. When Frontenac arrived in 1672, Laval "et les Jésuites" "were governing the Canadian church according to their conception, and their influence was great even in the administration of civil affairs."[8]

---

[4] Dudouyt to Laval, March 1682, ASQ, *Lettres,* Carton N, no. 61.

[5] *Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin, récollet. Les Pièces Documentaires,* Montreal, 1937, 17 ff.

[6] "Le Père Hennepin, récollet, à Paris, 1682," in *Nos Cahiers,* III. 1938, 105-140.

[7] *Nos Cahiers,* III, 1938, 122.

It is best not to dawdle away time, arguing over conceptions of church administration and whether those of the Jesuits, of the bishop, or of Frontenac should have prevailed. All this is fine theory excogitated to whitewash a few ecclesiastical adventurers, and a layman sent to Canada to re-gild his coat of arms.[9] History spoke a strange thesis through the mouth of M. Lorin. He was bent on finding profound explanations for everything Frontenac did, wrote, or said. Lorin would see a symbol of the struggle between light and darkness in a cat and dog fight if it had taken place in Canada during the time of Frontenac. While there is virtue in putting the best interpretation on men's actions, there is none in excusing indefensible actions by laying the blame at the door of others. One thing history does say, does literally shout out from the documents of the period, is the unequivocal opposition of bishop and Jesuits to unrestricted selling of brandy to Indians as advocated by officialdom and by Frontenac. Lorin saw this to be the root of all the difficulties, for he is ever at pains throughout his book to find excuses for his hero all afire for the nefarious traffic. Now, some Recollects sided with the governor against the bishop on this question. Naturally, if one omits the brandy trade controversy, one must necessarily fall back for the cause of this antagonism on some vague, ethereal clash of "principles," on the clash between the idea of a politician and the "idealistic views upheld by inflexible authority.[10] To speak of "the pretended systematical opposition of the Recollects to the bishop . . . raised by some to the dignity of a thesis, of a postulate," and to declare that this is "simplified and false formula which misrepresents history and calumniates the Recollects,"[11] can only come from having initially overlooked a well established fact. It is not those who maintain that some Recollects systematically opposed the bishop in the brandy question who distort history, nor do they who assert that some Recollects upheld Frontenac's ideas about the brandy trade calumniate them.[12]

---

[8] *Ibid.,* 124.
[9] See *Mémoires de Saint-Simon,* VI, 170.
[10] *Nos Cahiers,* III, 123.
[11] *Ibid.,* 113.

This, however, is only by way of parenthesis. We are not concerned with the Recollects, but with a few members of the Order who have aired their views on questions which involve the Jesuits, and specifically on the trade they were engaged in. It is an astonishing sort of reasoning to hear that because one refutes downright falsehoods of a few men who happened to belong to the Recollect branch of the Order of St. Francis, therefore one does not like, one is an enemy, one slanders a great Order out of which have come legions of heroes, scholars, and saints.

> The Recollect [Hennepin] is accusing the Jesuits of being engaged in trade [de faire la traite]. This was in 1682. Now, neither in the *Description of Louisiana,* which he was then writing, nor in the *New Discovery* which he was to publish in 1697, does Father Hennepin make this accusation. Much more, in 1697, he will tell the incident . . . of 1679, when he had, as he said, taken the defense of the Jesuits against La Salle on the question of the trade carried on by the Jesuits. Had Father Hennepin changed his mind in the past two years? It does indeed seem so, and the basis is the sixteen letters of Jesuits which he had in his possession.[13]

A few explanatory paragraphs added to the one just quoted do not modify the implicit conclusion: Hennepin based his accusations on letters written by Jesuits. Can one ask for a better proof of guilt than the written confession of the accused? How did Hennepin get these letters? A poor attempt at humor is made when it is said: "There is little probability that he was the addressee. What then? . . . Then a very curious question arises and one to which I can give no answer at all."[14] Yet, the answer is relatively simple. Hennepin got these letters from the Jesuits of Quebec, from the Superior, because he could thereby render them a kind service. The mail ships had left, and Hennepin's charity would enable the Jesuit missionaries to communicate once more this year with the home land. The Jesuits of Quebec were evidently deceived by "our great Hennepin"[15] who shamelessly opened these private letters, read them, published them, instead of giving them to the addressees. He could not resist his curiosity. He had to see what these letters said and having seen had to cover his contemptible action by *claiming* that they contained the proof so long sought, that the Jesuits were trading. A little over a decade ago an attempt was made to foist on the public an apology for Hennepin. The Recollect is presented as endowed with every honorable quality, with humility, exquisite charity, zeal, disinterestedness, sincerity, absolute truthfulness, dignity, meekness, discretion, he was a second Bayard, for he was "sans peur et sans reproche."[16] The author of this charming bit of fiction had evidently not heard of the violation of private letters.

---

[12] Cf. Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 321-322.

[13] *Nos Cahiers,* III, 131.

[14] *Ibid.,* 132. Previously, another would be witty remark had been made: "Il ne faudrait pas, j'imagine, chercher dans Thwaites la lettre [of Dablon] qui était aux mains du P. Hennepin, non plus que les seize autres lettres de jésuites par lui détenues . . . ," *ibid.,* 117, note 37.

In 1682 Hennepin, busy composing his *Description of Louisiana,* made no mention of the trade of the Jesuits. Yet had he not those sixteen letters? In 1697, when he wrote his piece of "brazen mendacity,"[17] in the *New Discovery,* he had seen these letters, yet in this book he says he defended the Jesuits against La Salle's innuendoes. Hennepin, be it noted, wrote the incident of 1679, not two years before he got the letters, 1681, but fifteen years after he had seen them, 1697.

To whom did Hennepin first show the letters? To the friends and supporters of Frontenac, M. de l'Estrade, Mme. de Frontenac, Bernou, and Renaudot. Each of these persons, but especially the last two, could have put these so eagerly awaited "proofs" in the hands of the minister without delay. Yet in the private letters which Bernou wrote to Renaudot less than a year later, although the Abbé had often occasion to speak of Hennepin and of the Jesuits, there is no mention made of this most damaging evidence. And the reason for this silence is clear. Neither Renaudot, nor especially Bernou was an idiot. Both saw that the construction put on these letters by Hennepin would not stand examination. Neither wished to appear ridiculous in the company of the bragging Recollect. The interpretation did not convince even Hennepin, else he would have mentioned them again when he wrote his *New Discovery*. M. Dudouyt wrote that the Recollect "pretendoit convaincre par ces lettres les Jesuistes de beaucoup de choses et entre autres, quils faisoient la traitte. . . ." He contended that by means of these letters he would convict the Jesuits. He added only to his dishonesty.

---

[15] Goyens, "Le P. Louis Hennepin, O. F. M. . . . Quelques jalons pour sa biographie," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* XVIII, 1925, 482, page 38, in the reprint.

[16] Goyens, *loc. cit.,* 327 and 10.

[17] Parkman, *La Salle,* 123.

A further palliative for the reputation of the Recollect is added by his apologist:

> The accusation [of trade] was not new, even as early as 1682, and since then it has often been renewed. In 1900 M. Désiré Girouard, as conscientious an historian as he was a profound lawyer, wished to remove all doubts about the matter. After studying the question under all its aspects, under the historical, legal, and canonical aspects, he came to the conclusion that the Jesuit missionaries did not trade [ne firent pas la traite] in the commercial sense of the word, which in the case of missionaries would also imply censure.[18]

When Judge Girouard examined the question, the means of checking on the authors of the documents he criticized were not as easily available as they are today.

> On this point [the trade of the Jesuits] again Father Hennepin espouses the well known ideas of the governor. Was the Recollect in good faith? One has only to read the study of M. Girouard to realize that very often the circumstances of the traffic carried on by the Jesuit missionaries were such that many, very sincerely deceived by the appearances, believed that they were engaged in trade, while such was not at all the case. Father Hennepin too may have been deceived, as he was deceived after his poorly digested reading of sixteen letters written by Jesuits.[19]

---

[18] *Nos Cahiers,* III, 131.

[19] A written text meant nothing to Hennepin, he pretty much read it as he pleased. Thus he asserts that he read the dismissorial letter of La Salle attested by the General of the Jesuits. In this letter, the explorer is said to have spent the whole time among the

> There to my mind is not the great harm, but rather because he declared open war on the Jesuits *sur une matière controuvée.* Prudence as well as charity demanded that he keep a discreet silence.[20]

Not only prudence and charity, but truth demanded that he keep silent. He prattled about the trade of the Jesuits, because he knew what Renaudot and Bernou wanted to hear about it. He also knew that neither Frontenac, nor La Salle had found proofs, but he, the "great Hennepin," was at last bringing those long awaited proofs. Hennepin was not "deceived by the appearances." He roamed over all the Jesuit missions, in the Iroquois country and in the West. He lived in the missions longer than any other accuser. He knew the exchanges made by the missionaries in the mission were not trade in the commercial sense, knew the meaning of *traiter,* of *faire la traite* in Canada. The assumption is, after spending six years in New France, Hennepin saw no trade in the missions, but sixteen letters made him realize he had been blind to the obvious. Regrettably, the writer was not specific as regards the other "many sincerely deceived by appearances." It would be interesting to know who they were and to see the documentary proofs.

Hennepin must have been "undeceived" when he wrote his *New Discovery* in 1697. "Had he convinced himself, since 1682, that the letter of Father Dablon on which he based [his accusation that the Jesuits were the cause of the Iroquois-Illinois war] was not saying what he first thought it said?"[21] This question was asked, because, when Hennepin wrote the history of this war in detail in the *New Discovery,* he did not mention the Jesuits. The same question may be asked about the trade of the Jesuits. If he had convinced himself of the erroneousness of his interpretation

---

Jesuits, eight and a half years, "without giving the least suspicion of *Venial Sin.* These are the very Words of the Act, for I have perus'd it my self," *New Discovery,* I, 99. Again, in the *New Voyage,* "He [La Salle] shew'd me a letter written at *Rome* by the General of that Order [Jesuit] wherein he testified that the said Sieur *de la Salle* had behav'd himself prudently in everything without giving the least occasion to be suspected of a venial Sin," *ibid.,* II, 428. Cf. the letter of the General to La Salle in Rochemonteix, III, 47, n. 2.

[20] *Nos Cahiers,* III, 132.

[21] *Ibid.,* 132.

of 1682, what brought about this new conviction? He cannot be said to have changed his mind on account of new facts learned in Renty, in Gosselies, in Antwerp, in Amsterdam, or in Utrecht. No one would go to these places to find such counter evidence as would change one's "conviction" about the trade of the Jesuits in Canada. Hennepin was already known as an irresponsible prevaricator. An ingrate toward Duluth, he maligned La Salle, Tonti, and the Indians. In 1682, to pay his court to a small coterie in Paris, he repaid the recent kindnesses and the confidence of the Jesuits in an unmanly fashion.

Beside Hennepin, two other Recollects wrote about New France in the second half of the seventeenth century, Sixte Le Tac and Christian Le Clercq. The books have the set purpose to decry the *Jesuit Relations,* to ridicule their contents, and this is specially true of the fifteenth chapter of Le Clercq.[22] The incongruity of this is striking, when one realizes it would be difficult to find in historical literature works teeming with more fabrications than this trilogy.[23] What is found in these historical novels, however, is not a criticism of the *Relations* as they were published and as they are known today. The authors distorted, grossly perverted, and burlesqued the narratives, then proceeded to criticize what they said was contained in them. The procedure still has adherents. The fifteenth chapter in Le Clercq and most of those which follow were added by another hand.[24] Throughout the text of the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France,* are found inconsistencies, suppressions of facts, ignorance of facts concerning Le Clercq himself, indicating other authorship.[25] Le Clercq's book got the distinction of being commented upon by the head of the Jansenist party.[26]

---

[22] Le Clercq, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France,* Shea's translation, New York, 1881, I, 376-410. Cf. Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . . ,* 159.

[23] Sulte, IV, 108, fully approves what is contained in this chapter. It goes to show that he either did not read the *Relations,* or if he read them, he did not understand what he read. A few lines after his solemn utterances about the *Relations,* Sulte modestly attributes to himself the monopoly of knowledge and of critical spirit. Then: "Le premier hâbleur venu fait parler un journal . . ." It would be difficult to find a better characterization for Sulte, *hâbleur;* cf. J. C. Taché, *Les Histoires de M. Sulte,* Montreal, 1883, and *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXII, 1926, 340.

[24] Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . . ,* 159, Shea, *First Establishement of the Faith,* 31-32; *Some La Salle Journeys,* 67, note 10; *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* 9-10, 16-20.

The first intimation that the Recollects were cleared of any leanings toward trade occurs in connection with their being interpreters for the French:

> It is true that our Fathers had always kept aloof from trade, so as to avoid the slightest appearance, the gentlemen of the Company often used interpreters in their trade . . . in all other intercourses with Savage nations [beside trade relations], either for peace or for war, as well as for the establishment of the Faith no interpreters were employed except the Recollects.[27]

But patently, other missionaries, Jesuits for instance, were not so careful of their vow of poverty. The horror of trade reaches the proportion of a phobia when the author quotes from another Recollect, Sagard.[28] The latter was not as squeamish, and did not hesitate to use the word "trade." Le Clercq or the editor used Sagard extensively for the early years of the evangelization of Canada, but they mutilated Sagard, omitting passages where the word "trade" is used. Thus in one suppressed passage Sagard flatly contradicts the assertion quoted above. Printing a letter to Father Joseph de la Roche d'Aillon, also a Recollect, Sagard has: "I have always seen them [Hurons] constant in their resolution to go with at least four canoes to the trade if I would guide them, the whole difficulty being that we did not know the way."[29] This passage, as well as several others on trade, was suppressed by the "editor." So, too, were the protests of Father de la Roche d'Aillon[30] against the famous amalgamation of French and Indians, so strongly advocated in the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France.*[31]

---

[25] Cf. Le Clercq, II, 80, 88.

[26] *Morale Pratique des Jesuites,* 1716^2, VII, 235-326, Chapter X, "Reflexions sur un livre donné au public par les RR. PP. Recollects en 1691, intitulé: Premier établissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle France."

[27] Le Clercq, I, 250, cf. 358.

[28] Cf. Le Clercq, I, 266, 267, 270, 271, for the omissions of the passages from the letter in Sagard where the "word" *trade* is found. Shea supplied these passages in his translation.

[29] Sagard, *Histoire du Canada . . . ,* Paris, 1636, 885.

[30] Sagard, *Histoire du Canada . . . ,* 890-891.

The insinuations about the Jesuit trade found in Le Clercq became positive assertions in Sixte Le Tac.[32] On the word of Sulte the editor asserts the manuscript to be in the Recollect's handwriting.[33] If Le Tac is the author, the first page should prejudice the reader against him. He hid himself behind a mask, he concealed his identity, telling the addressee of the dedicatory epistle that he is a soldier. The editor absolves his Recollect from an outright lie, explaining, "If the author—Le Tac—were found out, he could have answered that he was waging war, 'holy war.' "[34] It is rather surprising to find Réveillaud indulging in this kind of casuistry. According to his coreligionists the Jesuits had the monopoly of it.

The manuscript of the *Histoire chronologique* contains several passages deleted by the author and printed between brackets by the editor. In the margin is found a note by Le Tac saying: "Read what has been crossed out, if you wish. The remorse of my conscience made me delete these passages, believing them to be against charity. However, as there is here nothing but the truth, you may read them if you wish."[35] The editor suggests that if this manuscript had been published at the end of the seventeenth century, the author would have omitted the passages crossed out. If Le Tac considered he was truthful in the bracketed passages, his case does not belong to the historian, but to the psychiatrist. In the first passage in brackets, we are told:

> I flatter myself that I am sincere in what I am about to say. But because truth breeds hatred, I do not think it expedient to make myself known to the public, especially as I have to speak

---

[31] Cf. Le Clercq, I, 188, 189, 254-256, II, 79.

[32] *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France ou Canada, depuis sa découverte (mil cinq cents quatre) jusques en l'an mil six cents trente deux,* Paris, 1888; on this lampoon, cf. A. Bouchard, "Une Histoire du Canada," *Revue Canadienne,* XXIV, 1888, 348-366, 729-737, H. P. Biggar, *The Early Trading Companies of New France,* Toronto, 1901, 287-290.

[33] *Histoire chronologique,* vii-viii; on authorship cf. *Revue Canadienne,* XXIV, 1888, 349, 733-736.

[34] *Histoire chronologique,* I, note.

[35] *Ibid.,* 5.

> of certain people [Jesuits] who do not know how to spare those who wish to correct them. It suffices that you should know me. I submit my manuscript to your censure. Do with it what you please.[36]

Next to the passage where the Jesuits are accused of trade is found a marginal note reading: "Who are the happy ones and the unhappy ones" in Canada? There are three printed pages in brackets where we are told of the great authority of the Jesuits, of the hampering of consciences, of the tyranny of the inquisition-like organization the *Sainte-Famille,* etc., the ordinary fare found in the early letters of Frontenac and later in those of Cadillac.

> The workmen who are not debauched live at ease and can make money. The merchants become rich in a short time. The profit which can be made on merchandises causes the rich communities to have them brought from France. Each of these communities has its warehouse. The priests of the Séminaire and the Jesuits are the happiest and the richest. They share among themselves the profits that can be made both among the French and among the Indians. The first, beside the pension paid them by the king, are canons or parish priests in the best parishes of the country, for which they are granted 300 livres bonus by the Court, so that a priest who is a seminarist, a canon, and a parish priest has three sources of revenue at once, and makes a great profit for the Séminaire. The Jesuit Fathers who abandon the care of the parishes to the [diocesan] ecclesiastics reserve to themselves that of the Indians, who are a source of great temporal profits; since by giving some merchandise to those barbarians, they amass a quantity of beaver skins. They easily carry on this little traffic, because they are alone among the Indians and because they allow the French to go thither [in the missions] only rarely and with difficulty, unless the French share the profits with them.[37]

---

[36] *Ibid.,* 8-9.

[37] *Histoire chronologique,* 26-29. Margry in the introduction to the fifth volume of his compilation, cviii, quoted this and a few other passages from the *Histoire chronologique.* He attributed it to a *militaire*; Sulte had not as yet decided who the author was. Margry's reason for quoting it, he said, was because he feared to appear a partisan rather than a lover of truth. Enough examples of his love for truth have been given in the preceding pages to comment on this assertion. Cf. also I, Introduction, XVIII. "Pour nous qui ne cherchons que la verité, nous sommes obligé de dire qu'ici, à bien regarder, les livres des Récollets ne sont pas non plus des guides sûrs pour l'histoire." Margry is speaking too often of his love for truth,

Had the book been published, the last assertion would have appeared rash and ridiculous to the whole of New France. A great hero of Le Tac, Sieur de la Salle,[38] visited and traded in most of the western Jesuit missions, and to our knowledge there is no record that either he or any other of the 800 coureurs de bois at the time when Le Tac wrote ever made any payment to the Jesuits, the only missionaries in the West. Le Tac was never in the West; who told this to him? Neither Frontenac nor anybody else ever mentioned this Jesuit tribute. The editor adds in a note, "The picture of the Jesuits is not a flattering one." It is not hard to agree with Réveillaud. But, continues the same editor, "in spite of the bitterness which is felt between the lines of our historian, [his testimony] cannot be doubted after so many concurring testimonies of all the chroniclers of the time." And to clinch the argument, Réveillaud refers to Sulte! It were better to leave out all appeal to Sulte's authority. The broad statement about the universal concurrence of chroniclers of the period shows beyond doubt Réveillaud's very limited reading. Lahontan, continues the learned editor, "is the only one who feigns to doubt it," namely, that the Jesuits were engaged in trade. He quotes the passage in which the baron states in unmistakable terms that the Jesuits did not trade, and had no factors, either of which, if facts, people in Canada would know.[39] Lahontan was in the West, whereas there is no record that Le Tac ever went farther than Three Rivers. The baron was at Michilimackinac and at Sault Ste. Marie. He cared nothing for the reputation of the Jesuits, or for anybody else when he published his book in 1703.[40] Unless the evidence

---

of his seeking after truth, he is too often disclaiming partisanship to be believed even if one lacked proofs that truth and impartiality were the least of his worries.

[38] *Histoire chronologique,* 46.

[39] *New Voyages,* I, 385-386.

[40] "The whole is writ with a great deal of Fidelity; for I represent things just as they are. I neither flatter nor spare any Person whatsoever. . . . Notwithstanding the Veneration I have for the Clergy, I impute to them all the mischief the Iroquese have done to the French Colonies, in the course of a war that had never been undertaken, if it had not been for the Counsels of these pious Church-Men," *New Voyages,* I, 6. "I flatter no Man, and I spare no body. I scorn to be partial; I bestow due praise upon those who are in no capacity to serve me, and I censure the Conduct of others, that are

had been such as almost to force him to deny that the Jesuits carried on trade in their missions, we can be assured that Lahontan would have had no scruples in stating that they did. Yet, added Réveillaud, "one feels the intention to speak ironically in these lines." The editor had a very keen sense of "feeling." Perhaps this "feeling" approach may be the solution of many an historical problem of criticism; in fact, it would eliminate criticism.

Le Tac, in another deleted passage, speaking of the trade of the Jesuits of Canada, has them very rich. They keep for themselves the alms received for the Indians and they charge six times the price of the goods they sell to the Indians, which, he adds, "the Recollects would never do, for they do not run after the pelts, nor after riches."[41] Now, when Réveillaud saddled a Recollect with this "drunk with choler" lampoon, no wonder a Canadian reviewer wrote: "Thus a Recollect, it is claimed, wrote the history of Canada. But as he knew that if he had published such abominations, the whole colony would have arisen to brand him on the forehead, he took good care to hide his manuscript and to hide himself behind a mask."[42]

SECTION 5. CONCLUSION

And thus the evidence usually produced to brand the Jesuits with the guilt of trade in New France has been examined and quoted at length, and men prominent in the history of New France have passed in review. One fact must stand out prominently: the assertions credited to contemporary writers have proved in the main to be veiled insinuations, and no positive proof has ever been produced by the anti-Jesuit party in France or in Canada. The latter gave themselves over to accusations couched in general terms; "they expressed their opinion of the Jesuits rather than expressing the truth."[1] Those who have accepted the legend

---

capable of doing me an injury by indirect Method. . . . 'Tis beneath me to mince or alter the matter of fact, contained either in the Letters I sent you some ten or twelve years agoe, or in these Memoirs," *ibid.*, I, 299-300.

[41] *Histoire chronologique,* 123.

[42] *Revue Canadienne,* XXIV, 1888, 357.

[1] G. M. Wrong, *The Rise and Fall of New France,* New York, 1928, I, 441.

have allowed their judgment to be ruled by preconceived ideas rather than by the available evidence. This attitude of religious bias has notoriously obfuscated the history of New France, in which the Jesuits played only a part, and it will take considerable time and patient spading to clear away the litter. The bogey of Jesuitism filled the mind of the nineteenth century bourgeoisie. Jesuitism was vague enough for attack, and notoriety could thus be attained by ecclesiastical adventurers and other pamphleteers imbued with the tradition that where Jesuits are concerned no proofs are necessary no matter how preposterous the statements may be. Under these circumstances of warped minds and atavistic prejudices, the ultimate answer to the question "Did the Jesuits of New France trade?" could be only affirmative.

At present a far more scholarly and critical spirit in weighing the assertions of actors in the French-American drama is making itself felt. The attitude of the Jesuits toward the brandy trade is today attributed to other motives than to a desire to monopolize the nefarious traffic to themselves in the hope of filthy lucre.[2] Their irreconcilable attitude was the only attitude they could take in the matter, the only attitude defensible from the moral standpoint. Had they catered to the politicians, they might have earned the dubious approval of the eager grafters of New France; they may even have been considered zealous, broadminded missionaries who knew how to put the consciences of the people at ease, while in France, the prattling abbés might have shouted "Laxism!" For this approval, however, they would have to sacrifice principles of much greater moment than the praise of a few ruined petty noblemen. "Hatred, and perhaps to a greater extent, pecuniary interests can explain their [Frontenac's, La Salle's, and Cadillac's] language. The Jesuits were the most determined adversaries of the brandy trade among the Indians, and this alone rendered them accursed in the eyes of those men who wished to get rich no matter by what means."[3] And Eastman commented: "It is quite natural that the men with whose commerce or industry Jesuit piety seemed to interfere should retaliate by insinuating that the missionaries were animated by mercenary motives."[4] Whether natural or not is beside the point, the question is: is it true?

---

[2] Eastman, 290.

[3] D. Girouard, "Les Jésuites ont-ils traffiqué dans la Nouvelle-France?" in *La Semaine Religieuse de Montréal,* XXXV, 1900. 230.

> It was soon realized by the missionaries [Jesuits] that but meager results could be obtained until the Indians were induced to lead a sedentary life. Their wandering habit nullified all attempts at permanent instruction to the young; it engendered improvidence and laziness, bred famine and disease; and the constant struggle to kill fur-bearing animals for their pelts rapidly depleted the game while the fur trade wrought contamination in many forms. Missionary efforts were at first conducive to the interests of the fur trade, by bringing far distant tribes within the sphere of French influence; but as soon as the Jesuit sought to change the habits of the natives, to cause them to become agriculturists instead of hunters, and to oppose the rum traffic among them, then the grasping commercial monopoly which controlled the fortunes of New France, and was merely "working" the colony for financial gains, saw in the Jesuit an enemy, and often placed serious obstacles in his path.[5]

A protestant writer has vindicated the Jesuits with regard to the liquor question thus: "From the standpoint of the aborigines, the brandy trade was an unmitigated curse. The attitude of the Church and its supporters has been approved by subsequent experience, and endorsed by the more humane government of civilized countries."[6] Apologists of the greedy adventurers may excuse their heroes for not being ahead of their time, but this does not excuse critical historians for failure to inquire into the value of the testimony they so readily accepted and for their acceptance of depositions from anticlericals whose profits were curtailed by the clergy of Canada. The bishop and his priests, the Sulpicians and the Jesuits were determined to protect the defenseless Indians, and consequently, since their attitude sprang from a more developed sense of justice, of humanity, and of religion, credit for being ahead of their time should justly have been given them.

---

[4] Eastman, 89.
[5] Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations,* Introduction, I, 18-19.
[6] Eastman, 291.

The same Protestant writer also showed that on the whole the Indian liquor traffic was harmful for the French colony.[7] If the Jesuits had shut their eyes to this evil, they would not have been accused of encroaching upon the sacrosanct royal prerogatives. The gallican regalists of Canada, civil or ecclesiastical, have still to produce concrete proofs of Jesuit violations of any laws. "All the vague, unproved allegations which are found in the memoirs sent to the Court only prove the ill-will and impotence of the enemies of the missionaries."[8] The only time the Jesuits in New France came in conflict with the secular authorities was with regard to the brandy question. Four score years ago, Father Félix Martin issued a challenge, asking for proof of another instance of a purely civil or political nature which caused a clash between the missionaries and the civil authorities. His challenge has never been answered, except by pompous individuals, self-styled scholars afflicted with psittacism.

> Neither the bishop, nor the Jesuits ever attempted to meddle unduly in the temporal government of the colony. They never showed a pretention to direct or dominate the administration of justice, questions of tariffs and taxes, they never framed police regulations, conducted expeditions, decided peace or war.

When they were asked for their advice they gave it. Of course, neither the bishop, nor the Jesuits claimed the privilege of infallibility in their public acts. They made mistakes. "We energetically maintain that the accusation that they wished to usurp political and temporal authority in the colony was nothing else than a groundless Gallican quarrel." It was one of the aspects of civil Gallicanism, always on the watch to denounce the encroachments of the Church. In Canada, this was merely a pretext, what the Gallicans objected to was the firmness with which Laval and the Jesuits exercised their spiritual authority in the repression of abuses, but above all in their uncompromising fight against the brandy traffic.[9]

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 292.

[8] *Relations inédites*, II, 355.

In South America, in Brazil especially, the accusations against the Jesuits, the calumnies launched against them, the various expulsions from the Portuguese dominions, their difficulties with the colonists, and with the civil authorities, all sprang from one source—the missionaries opposed in season and out of season the enslavement of the defenseless Indians. In New France officialdom had another way of enslaving the Indians. Instead of exterminating them or enslaving them, the same results were obtained by selling brandy to the natives. To explain a "politique indigène" based on brandy, a few adventurers are defended on the ground that they opposed the ambition of the bishop and the missionaries, as if it were not manifestly idle to give the morbid suspicions of the politicians of the day as "proofs" of the existence of such ambition.

As already noted, Judge Désiré Girouard treated at length the question of the Jesuit trade. In his article published in *La Semaine Religieuse de Montréal,* he examined successively the facts themselves, the reasons why the Jesuits were suspected, the juridical value of these suspicions. His unequivocal verdict is "not guilty." After quoting the saying of Kalm: "Neither the priests nor the Jesuits carry on any trade with furs and skins, leaving that entirely to the merchants,"[10] Judge Girouard continued:

> Such is also my opinion on the so-called trade of the Jesuits. I sketched this question in my book[11] and I have treated it at length here, after having read the recently arrived fifteen volumes of the *Correspondance générale* covering the end of the seventeenth century. It was not an easy task to reach this conclusion. Despatches, memoirs, letters, nearly all the documents which treat of this delicate question are so full of contradictions, accusations, recriminations, behind which one can only too often discern pecuniary interest and greediness, hatred and jealousy, that it has not always been easy to distinguish truth from falsehood, or even from error. I have been sadly surprised

---

[9] Chapais, *Jean Talon,* 44-45.

[10] *Peter Kalm's Travels in North America,* A. B. Benson ed., New York, 1937, II, 451.

[11] D. Girouard, *Lake St. Louis,* Montreal, 1893, 295-297.

to see that at the beginning of our history—called by Lord Elgin the heroic period—when there were many heroes and martyrs, men and women, clerics and laymen, there should have been so many rascals. But, and this must be said, the rif-raf was not found among the clergy, the religious communities, or in the body of the settlers, that is, among the owners and clearers of the soil, seigniors and tenants, but rather among the nobles, the officials, the governors, the judges, the officers of all grades, brave in time of war, if one wishes, but who were in the colony to make their fortune, and who did not remain here. The Marquis de Denonville wasn't far from the truth when he wrote that the nobility of this new country was a most beggarly crowd. Frontenac, La Salle, and Lamothe Cadillac ceaselessly wrote to the court that the country was full of envious people, of backbiters, of slanderers, that it is almost impossible to see through so many cabals, intrigues, calumnies, hatred, and clashing interests. The task of arriving at the truth in the company of such a lot is not easy. I have done my best to discover it. I do not know whether my work will throw some light on the matter. I do not expect it to be the last word. I flatter myself, however, to have remained exempt from prejudice or sympathy. I have not even the honor of knowing the Jesuits personally. I was educated by the Sulpicians whom Father de Rochemonteix does not always handle gently; but I would deem myself unworthy of my Alma Mater if I failed to render a favorable verdict to those who have a right to it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SCOURCES

OTTAWA.

The letters of M. Louis Tronson. On this correspondence, cf. text, p. 12, n. 6.

PARIS.

Archives des Colonies, (AC). Series B. This series contains the letters sent by the home government, king and ministers, to the officials in Canada. Letters in vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, were consulted; transcripts of these letters were found in the Dominion Archives, Ottawa, Canada. The series is calendared in the *Report on Canadian Archives for 1899, Supplement,* Ottawa, 1901, 245 ff. Many of the utilized documents are printed in various publications as indicated in the footnotes.

AC, *Correspondance Générale, Canada,* (C 11A). The series contains the letters and memoirs sent from the colony to the mother country. This was the main source. Volumes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, cover the period studied; they are calendared in the *Report on Canadian Archives for 1885,* Ottawa, 1886, xxix-lvii. Talon's correspondence is in vols. 2 and 3; it is printed in the *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1930-1931,* (RAPQ), Quebec, 1931, 1-182. The archivist says in the introduction: "Les lettres de Talon que nous publions ici ne changeront aucune des appréciations de M. Chapais. Elles ajouteront même très peu à son livre, mais il convenait de les mettre au jour d'une façon définitive parce que celles de ces lettres qui ont été publiées dans des recueils de documents sont tronquées ou incomplètes. Le texte que nous offrons a été photographié sur l'original même de chacune des lettres de Talon. On pourra donc s'y fier comme si on avait la lettre originale sous les yeux." There are, however, peculiarities which the printed page cannot show, and it will repay to compare it with the photographs themselves. Photostats of these letters are in the Library of Congress. Besides the letters of Talon found in these two volumes, M. P.-G. Roy, the archivist of the Province of Quebec, included others which are found in other series. A few letters of Talon or to him are translated into English in E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York,* (NYCD), IX, Albany, 1855.

The letters of Frontenac in volumes 4, 5, 6, of this series have also been published in the *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1926-1927,* Quebec, 1927, 1-144. They cover the governor's first term in office, 1672-1682; those of his second term have been published in subsequent *Rapports.* The publication of Frontenac's letters, although incomparably better than in any previous collection, is not as satisfactory as the publication of the letters of Talon. Some documents found in other series, for instance in the Moreau de Saint-Méry collection (AC, F 3), were not included. Moreover, after 1675, the letters of Duchesneau are indispensable for an adequate understanding of the state of affairs in the colony. A few are in Clément and in NYCD. The same may be said of Frontenac's second term. M. Roy did not publish the letters sent by, or addressed individually to the intendant Champigny. Before their publication in 1927, relatively few of Frontenac's letters were in print. Clément published some, others could be found in the *Collection de Manuscrits (infra)* and in the *Correspondance échangée (infra).* Margry has a few valueless extracts. Extracts from some letters of Frontenac and Duchesneau are translated in NYCD.

A few documents from volumes 9 and 12 of AC, C 11A, were also utilized.

AC, F 3. Documents in volumes 2, 3, 4, 5 proved serviceable. Volume 5, ff. 75-82, contains the speeches pronounced in the "brandy parliament"; the document is printed *in extenso* in Margry, I, 405-420 and in *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 247-253. The papers of this series were assembled by Médéric-Louis-Elie Moreau de Saint-Méry, cf. J.-E. Roy, *Rapport sur les Archives de France,* 490-495; until they were given the present press-mark, F 3, they were cited under the collector's name. Volumes 2 to 16 are calendared in the *Report on Canadian Archives for 1899, Supplement,* 39-191.

Archives des Affaires Etrangères, (AE), Mémoires et Documents, *Amérique,* vol. 5. With the exception of the letter of Louis XIV to Laval, March 2, 1668, the few pertinent documents in this volume were found in other series.

Archives Nationales, (AN), K 1232:n. 1. The original of the document known as the *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée.* —Text, p. 215 and ff.

K 1232:n. 40. "Declaration des Terres que les pere[s] Jesuites possedent dans le pays de la Nouvelle France en 1663." A note on the first page reads: "Cecy est la copie de la declaration qui a esté mise entre les mains de M^r l'intendant En octobre

1663." The document is printed in R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations,* 47, 258-271.

Bibliothèque Nationale, (BN), Collection Clairambault, 1016: 43-48v; Bernou's memoir of 1678, cf. text, p. 175 ff. In the same volume are some autograph letters of La Salle printed in Margry, vol. II.

BN, Manuscrits francais, nouvelles acquisitions, (Mss. fr. n. a.), vol. 7497; a volume of autograph letters of Claude Bernou to Eusèbe Renaudot.

Volume 9288, ff. 18-40, Margry's copy of AN, K 1232:n. 1.

BN, Mélanges de Colbert. Some of the letters of Talon to Colbert in this series are printed in the *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1931.* There are other letters about Talon, for instance in volume 153bis; of Laval to Colbert, in vols. 164 and 176; of the Provincial of the Recollects, in vol. 171; of Frontenac, November 10, 1674, *ibid.,* f. 54; of Eustache Maupassant, November 12, 1674, *ibid.,* f. 57. The last two are printed in the *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXVII, 1937, 602-603, and 677-679, respectively. In this publication the date of the letter of Father Maupassant is given as 1679.

QUEBEC.

Archives du Séminaire de Québec (Laval University), (ASQ). The present writer was given every facility to consult these archives by the former archivist, Mgr A. E. Gosselin. The various series are divided into *cartons* (boxes), the label indicating the general contents. For certain series that have many documents, each box is lettered or given a roman numeral; all the documents are numbered. Several students have drawn on this important archival depot, among them E. C. H. Langevin, Auguste Gosselin, T. Chapais, H. Lemay. Most useful was the series *Lettres,* Carton N, where Dudouyt's correspondence with Laval is found. The following are quoted in the text:

Lettres, Carton N, no. 27, Colbert to Laval, March 7, 1668, no. 48^2, Dudouyt to Laval, (May, 1677), published, French and English, in the *Report on Canadian Archives for 1885,* xcviii-cxxxi. The next five are all from Dudouyt to Laval, no. 54, April 11, 1681; no. 57, May 10, 1681; no. 59, June 15, 16, 20, 1681; no. 61, March 9, 1682; no. 62, May 26, 1682.—Carton M, no. 11 and no. 21, Glandelet to Tremblay, September 3, 1691, and March 21, 1696.—Carton S, no. 93, Dudouyt to Laval, [May, 1677].

Polygraphie, IV, no. 19 to 30. Twelve documents on the brandy trade.—Text, p. 117, note 34.

ROME.

Jesuit Archives, (ASJ). The following documents of the series Gallia 110 have been utilized:

1) 1664, August 26, Dablon to Oliva, I, 35-36.
2) 1665, July 1, "Le revenue de la mission de Canada le 1er iour de Juillet 1665," I, 39.
3) 1666, November 10, Talon to Oliva, III, 366-366v, printed in Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France,* III, 34, note 1; reprinted in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXXVII, 1931, 659.
4) 1670, [August 26], Le Mercier to Oliva, I, 54-56.
5) 1678, November 13, Dablon to the Cardinal of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, III, 370-376.
6) 1717, October 21, Garnier to Tamburini, II, 326-327.

PRINTED SOURCES

The following bibliography seems as complete as necessary. Not all the books or articles read or consulted in the preparation of this volume have been listed, but each book quoted at least once is mentioned below. After some contemporary or quasi-contemporary accounts bearing directly on the questions treated in this volume, a few words of comment have been added or references given to the text where the particular passages of these accounts are discussed. The contemporary accounts are listed twice, under the names of their author and editor when these do not coincide. For instance, the *Memoire sur les Moeurs* of Perrot is listed after Perrot, the author, and after Tailhan, the editor. Compilations of sources have been evaluated according to the selection made of documents with which the present author is concerned, but especially with regard to the manner in which they are edited.

As for secondary accounts, monographs, modern interpretations, the more important have been commented upon, and the remarks bear only on what their authors have had to say with regard to the questions treated in this volume. Some works listed below are clearly popular accounts. Their authors were satisfied with merely elaborating or summarizing the interpretations of their guides; they belong to the third or fourth hand classes of books. In most cases the interpretations they found in secondary accounts were accepted or rejected by them on general principles, without attempt to study the primary evidence. Finally among the books in this bibliography, some are listed because they treat of a particular phase of the history of Canada. They were read because they contain information not found in general histories, such are the works of Lanctôt, Delalande, Munro, Cahall, on civil administration in New France. The present writer is not qualified to pass judgment on the value of such studies and monographs. He would be guilty of trespassing were he to comment favorably or adversely on works that are outside his competence. The saying attributed to Apelles —*ne supra crepidam*—finds its application not only to critics of works of art, but to critics of historical works as well.

Arnauld, A. *Morale Pratique des Jesuites,* s. l. 1716^{2}, vol. VII.—Text. pp. 223, 236.

Basset, J. S., ed. "Letters of Francis Parkman to Pierre Margry," in *Smith College Studies in History,* VIII, 1923.

Baugy, L. H. Chevalier de. *Journal d'une expédition contre les Iroquois en 1687,* Paris, 1883.—Text p. 155, note 40.

[Belmont, F. Vachon de.] "Histoire de l'eau-de-vie en Canada," in *Collection de Mémoires et de Relations sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada,* n. 8, Quebec, 1840.

Benson, A. B., ed. *Peter Kalm's Travels in North America,* 2 vols., New York, 1937. See vol. II, 171, note 2, the judgment of the editor on the value as Kalm as source.

Boislile, A. de, ed. *Mémoires de Saint-Simon,* 25 vols., Paris, 1879-1913, vol. VI.

Boucher, P. *Histoire veritable et naturelle des Moeurs et Productions du pays de la Nouvelle-France,* G. Coffin, ed., Montreal, 1882.

Champlain, Samuel de. *Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France Occidentale, dicte Canada,* Paris, 1632.

Clement, P., ed. *Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Colbert,* 7 vols., Paris, 1861-1873, vol. III, second part.—Text, p. 7, note 9.

Coffin, G., ed., Boucher, P., *Histoire veritable et naturelle des Moeurs et Productions du pays de la Nouvelle-France,* Montreal, 1882.

Collection de Manuscrits contenant lettres, mémoires et autres documents historiques relatifs à la Nouvelle France, 4 vols., Quebec, 1883-1885.

This collection contains extracts—sometimes only a few lines—from letters of Louis XIV, Colbert, Frontenac and Duchesneau, and they deal mostly with Acadian affairs. Students have justly complained of the manner in which they were edited, cf. G. Stewart, "Sources of Early Canadian History," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 1, III, 1886, section 2, 40.

Correspondance échangée entre les autorités françaises et les gouverneurs et intendants, vol. I, Quebec, 1893.

Owing to lack of funds, only one volume was published. It has three distinct, although not formal parts. The first ranging from 1620 to 1761 contains the letters sent by the kings of France exclusively. In this part are found the royal instructions to Talon, to Frontenac, and five extracts from the letters of Louis XIV to the governor. The second part begins p. 99; it has only four documents for the seventeenth century; the deliberations and orders of the Conseil de la Marine, which had charge of the affairs of the colony from 1715 to 1723 fill another hundred pages. In the third part are the letters sent by the ministers, Lionne, Colbert, Seignelay. There are four extracts of letters of Colbert to Frontenac and one extract from a letter of the minister to Duchesneau.

DANGEAU, PHILIPPE DE. *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau,* E. Soulié, Dussieux, *et al.,* ed.

[DOLLIER DE CASSON, F.] "Histoire du Montréal," in *Manuscripts relating to the Early History of Canada,* published under the auspices of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, third series, n. 1, Quebec, 1871. It had been published in the *Mémoires de la Société Historique de Montréal,* Montreal, 1869, and in the *Revue Canadienne* of the same year. It was translated by R. Flenley, (text and translation on opposite pages), under the title *A History of Montreal,* New York, 1928.

DUDOUYT, J. Letter of [May 1677] to Laval, printed in *Report on Canadian Archives for 1885,* xcviii-cxxxi.—Text p. 111 ff.

DUMESNIL, J. P. "Mémoire concernant les affaires du Canada," in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXI, 1915, 166-173, 193-200, 225-227.—Text, p. 161 ff.

Édits, ordonnances royaux, déclarations et arrêts du Conseil d'État du Roi concernant le Canada, 3 vols., Quebec, 1854-1856.

Factum du procès entre Jean de Biencourt, Sr de Poutrincourt et les Pères Biard et Massé, Jésuites, G. Marcel, ed., Paris, 1887.—Text, p. 137, note 13.

FLENLEY, R., ed. [Dollier de Casson, F.], *A History of Montreal,* New York, 1928.

GANONG, W. F., ed. Le Clercq, C., *New Relation of Gaspesia,* Toronto, 1910.

GOYER, O. "Oraison funèbre du très-haut et très-puissant Seigneur Louis de Buade, comte de Frontenac et de Paluau . . . prononcée en l'eglise des récolets de Kebec, . . . le 19 décembre, 1698," in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* I, 1895, 66-76, 82-89; annotations, 99-108.

HENNEPIN, L. *Description de la Louisiane nouvellement decouverte au Sud'Oüest de la Nouvelle-France,* Paris, 1683.

HENNEPIN, L. *Nouvelle decouverte d'un tres grand Pays, situé dans l'Amerique entre le Nouveau Mexique, et la Mer Glaciale,* Utrecht, 1697.

HENNEPIN, L. *Nouveau Voyage d'un Pais plus grand que l'Europe Avec les reflections des entreprises du Sieur de la Salle, sur les Mines de Ste Barbe, &c.,* Utrecht, 1698.

For Hennepin's views on the topics discussed in the text, see index, s. v. Hennepin.

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, R. G. Thwaites, ed., 73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901.

Le Journal des Jésuites, Laverdière, C. H., and Casgrain, H. R., ed., Quebec, 1871.

[JUCHEREAU DE SAINT IGNACE, F.] *Histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec,* Montauban, (1751).

Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France, 1663-1710, 6 vols., Quebec, 1885-1891.

The title sufficiently indicates the importance of this source. The information found in these volumes complements that of the letters sent to France by the colonial officials.

KALM, P. *Peter Kalm's Travels in North America,* A. B. Benson, ed., 2 vols., New York, 1937.

LAFITAU, J.-F. *Moeurs des sauvages ameriquains comparées aux moeurs des premiers temps,* 2 vols., Paris, 1724.

LAHONTAN, A. L. DE L'OM DARCE, BARON DE. *New Voyages to North America,* R. G. Thwaites, ed., Chicago, 1905.

For a general appraisal of the trustworthiness of Lahontan, cf. J.-E. Roy, "Le Baron de Lahontan," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Translations,* series 1, XII, 1895, section 1, 63-192. For the value of his testimony on the subject of this volume, see text, pp. 196, 264.

LA POTHERIE, C. C. LE ROY, SIEUR DE BACQUEVILLE DE. *Voyages de l'Amerique, contenant Ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable dans l'Amerique Septentrionale depuis 1534. jusqu'à present,* 4 vols., Amsterdam, 1723.

For the years 1697 to 1701, La Potherie was an eyewitness of many of the events he narrates; for the previous period, his testimony is secondary; he had access to Perrot's notes, but what is Perrot and what is his is difficult, almost impossible to ascertain. Cf. J.-E. Roy, "Claude Charles Le Roy de la Potherie," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 2, III, 1897, section 1, 3-44.

La Tour, L. B. de. *Mémoires sur la vie de Mgr de Laval, premier évêque de Québec,* Cologne, 1761.

La Tour spent two years in Canada, 1729-1731. Only one volume was published; it is said that the publication of the second volume was prevented by the family of Bishop Saint-Vallier. La Tour was in full agreement with the policy of Laval with regard to the brandy traffic. Cf. H.-A. Scott, "Louis Bertrand de la Tour et son Oeuvre," Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 3, XXII, 1928, section 1, 113-140, reprinted in *Nos anciens Historiographes,* Lévis, 1930, 183-224.

Laverdiere, C. H., ed. Champlain, *Oeuvres,* 6 vols., Quebec, 1870, vol. VI.

Laverdiere, C. H., and Casgrain, H. R., ed. *Le Journal des Jésuites,* Quebec, 1871.

Le Clercq, C. *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie,* Paris, 1691.

Le Clercq, C. *Premier Etablissement de la Foy dans la Nouvelle France,* 2 vols., Paris, 1691.

That Le Clercq's book was tampered with may be considered certain, cf. text, pp. 187, 236, 260. How much he wrote of the first volume, what share he had in the composition of the second, is by no means certain.

Lemay, H. *Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin, récollet. Les Pièces Documentaires,* Montreal, 1937.—Cf. *Mid-America,* XXI, 1939, 34-43.

Lescarbot, M. *Relation derniere dece qui s'est passée au voyage du Sieur de Poutrincourt en la Nouvelle-France depuis 20. mois ença,* Paris, 1612.—Text, p. 137, note 13.

Le Tac, S. *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France.* E. Réveillaud, ed., Paris, 1888.—Text, p. 262 ff.

Mandements, Lettres pastorales et circulaires des Évêques de Québec, H. Têtu and C.-O. Gagnon, ed., vol. I, Quebec, 1887.

Marcel, G., ed. *Factum de procès entre Jean de Biencourt, S^r de Poutrincourt et les Pères Biard et Massé, Jésuites,* Paris, 1887. —Text, p. 137, note 13.

Margry, P. *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans* *l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale,* 6 vols., Paris, 1876-1888, vols. I and II.

The criticism of the two documents printed in volume one of this compilation, text, p. 173 ff., and p. 215 ff., may serve to illustrate the manner in which Margry understood his duty as publisher of texts. The checking of Margry's versions on the documents themselves will convince any student that he was unfit for his task; aside from the tendentious character of the whole compilation. The extracts wrenched from their context are perhaps the most objectionable feature of his method, that is, leaving out downright mutilation of documents as is the case with the *Récit.* This systematic garbling of the evidence has been labelled "instances of bad judgment." The name one chooses to give to the process matters little, provided attention be called to this euphemism. His compilation must be referred to for the convenience of the reader, but it is rash to quote from it without seeing the context for the extracts, and without checking the text either on the originals, on photostats or on certified copies of the documents.

Marie de l'Incarnation. *Letters de la Venerable Mere Marie de l'Incarnation premiere Superieure des Ursulines de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, 1681.

Montezon, F. de, and Martin, F., ed. *Relations inédites de la Nouvelle-France (1672-1679) pour faire suite aux anciennes relations 1615-1672,* 2 vols., Paris, 1861.

Perrot, N. *Memoire sur les Moeurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale,* J. Tailhan ed., Leipzig and Paris, 1864.

[Raudot, A. D.] *Relation par lettres de l'Amerique Septentrionale,* C. de Rochemonteix, ed., Paris, 1904.—Text, p. 65, note 44.

Relations inédites de la Nouvelle-France, Montezon, F. de, and Martin, F., ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1861.

Reveillaud, E., ed. Le Tac, S., *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France ou Canada, depuis sa decouverte (mil cinq cents quatre) jusques en l'an mil six cents trente deux,* Paris, 1888.—Text, pp. 262-265.

Rochemonteix, C. de, ed. [Raudot, A. D.], *Relation par lettres de l'Amérique Septentrionale (années 1709 et 1710),* Paris, 1904.—Text, p. 65, note 44.

Roy, P.-G., ed. *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 19261927,* Quebec, 1927.—Cf. Manuscript Sources.

ROY, P.-G., ed. *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1930-1931,* Quebec, 1931.—Cf Manuscript Sources.

SAGARD THEODAT, GABRIEL. *Histoire du Canada et Voyages que les Freres Mineurs Recollects y ont faicts pour la conversion des Infidelles,* Paris, 1636.

SAINT-SIMON, Louis de Rouvroy, duc de. *Mémoires de Saint-Simon.* A. de Boislile, ed., 25 vols., Paris, 1879-1913.

SHEA, J. G., ed. *A Description of Louisiana by Father Louis Hennepin,* New York, 1880.

SHEA, J. G., ed. *First Establishment of the Faith in New France by Father Christian Le Clercq,* 2 vols., New York, 1881.

SOULIE, E., DUSSIEUX, *et al.,* ed. *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau publié en entier pour la première fois par MM. Eud. Soulié, Dussieux, de Chennevières, Maintz, de Montaiglon, avec les additions inédites du duc de Saint-Simon publiées par M. Feuillet de Conches,* 19 vols., Paris, 1854-1860. Vol. II.

TAILHAN, J., ed. Perrot, N. *Memoires sur les Moeurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale,* Leipzig and Paris, 1864.

TETU, H., and GAGNON, C.-O., ed. *Mandements, Lettres pastorales et circulaires de Évêques de Québec,* 6 vols., Quebec, 1887-1890. Vol. I.

THWAITES, R. G., ed. *A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America by Father Louis Hennepin,* 2 vols., Chicago, 1903.

THWAITES, R. G., ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents,* 73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901.

THWAITES, R. G., ed. *New Voyages to North America by the Baron de Lahontan,* 2 vols., Chicago, 1905.

GENERAL WORKS AND SPECIAL STUDIES

BIGGAR, H. P. *The Early Trading Companies of New France,* Toronto, 1901.

BOIS, L. E. *Esquisse de la vie et des travaux apostoliques de Sa Grandeur Mgr. Fr. Xavier de Laval-Montmorency,* Quebec, 1845.

BOUCHARD, A. "Une histoire du Canada," in *Revue Canadienne,* XXIV, 1888, 348-366, 729-737. Review of the *Histoire chronologique* of Sixtie Le Tac.—Text, p. 262, 265.

CAHALL, R. D. *The Sovereign Council of New France,* New York, 1915.

CHAMPRIS, G. de. *Monseigneur de Montmorency-Laval, premier évêque de la Nouvelle-France,* Paris, 1924.

Chapais, T. *Jean Talon: Intendant de la Nouvelle France, (1665-1672),* Quebec, 1904. The best and only dependable account of the two tenures of office of Talon.

Chapais, T. *The Great Intendant,* Toronto, 1914. A popular account in English of the preceding.

Charlevoix, P. F. X. de. *Histoire du Paraguay,* 3 vols., Paris, 1756, vol. III.

Charlevoix, P. F. X. de. *History and General Description of New France,* J. G. Shea, ed., 6 vols., New York, 1866-1872.

Charlevoix was the first to make use of the French Archives. The summaries of the documents he quotes is satisfactory. There are mistakes in his work, examples of carelessness, failures to evaluate his documents, but these slips are easily understood when it is remembered that he wrote two centuries ago. One has not to look very closely into the writings of some of his critics to find much more serious faults. The value of Charlevoix's text is greater in the English edition than in the French original owing to the abundant notes added by his translator, John Gilmary Shea. Cf. J.-E. Roy, "Essai sur Charlevoix, Première partie," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 3, I, 1907, section 1, 3-94, only one part was published; H.-A. Scott, *Nos anciens Historiographes,* Lévis, 1930, 167-181.

Colby, C. W., *The Fighting Governor,* Toronto, 1915.

[Daniel, F.] *Histoire des grandes familles françaises du Canada,* Montreal, 1867.

Delalande, J. *Le Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France,* Quebec, 1927.

[Desmazures, A. C. G.] *Colbert et le Canada,* Paris, 1879.

Dionne, N. E. "Le Séminaire de Notre-Dame-des-Anges," in *Revue Canadienne,* troisième série, III, 1890, 65-81, 148-166.

Delanglez, J. *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana,* 1700-1763, Washington, D. C. and New Orleans, 1935.

Delanglez, J., ed. *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* Chicago, 1938.

Delanglez, J. *Some La Salle Journeys,* Chicago, 1938.

Dussieux, L. E. *Le Canada sous la domination française,* Paris, 1855.

Eastman, M. *Church and State in Early Canada,* Edinburgh, 1915.

The author of this doctoral dissertation went to the sources; he reached conclusions at variance with the traditional interpretations of the Margry, Parkman, and Lorin school.

FAILLON, E. M. *Histoire de la Colonie Française en Canada,* 3 vols., Villemarie, 1865-1866.

FERLAND, J. B. A. *Cours d'histoire du Canada,* 2 vols., Quebec, 1861, 1865.

GARNEAU, F. X. *Histoire du Canada depuis sa découverte jusqu'à nos jours,* 3 vols., Quebec, 1859.

GIROUARD, J. D. "Les Jésuites ont-ils trafiqué dans la Nouvelle-France?" in *Semaine Religieuse de Montréal,* April 17, 1900. —Text, 266, 269.

GIROUARD, J. D. *Lake St. Louis, old and new, illustrated, and Cavelier de la Salle,* Montreal, 1893.

GOSSELIN, Aug. *Vie de Mgr de Laval, premier évêque de Québec et apôtre du Canada, 1622-1708,* 2 vols., Quebec, 1890.

In this biography of Laval, with whose views on the questions treated in the present volume Gosselin fully agrees, the author made use of the archives of Séminaire and of the Archbishopric of Quebec, as well as of most of the works in print when he wrote, especially La Tour. He did not draw directly on the French official archives, he cites the documents as in Ferland, Faillon and Parkman.

GOYENS, J. *Le P. Louis Hennepin, O. F. M., missionaire au Canada au XVII^e siècle: Quelques jalons pour sa biographie,* Quarrachi, 1925.

HARRISSE, H. *Notes pour servir à l'histoire, à la bibliographie et à la cartographie de la Nouvelle-France et des pays adjacents, 1545-1700,* Paris, 1872.

JOHNSON, I. A. *The Michigan Fur Trade,* Lansing, 1919.

LANCTOT, G. *L'administration de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, 1929.

LANCTOT, G. "Les Fonctions de l'intendant," in Canadian Historical Association, *Annual Report,* 1929, 73-90.

LANGEVIN, E. C. H. *Notice biographique sur François de Laval,* Montreal, 1874.

LEGENDRE, N. "Frontenac," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 2, IV, 1898, section 1, 37-52.

LEBLOND DE BRUMATH, A. *Bishop Laval,* Toronto, 1906.

LELAND, W. G. *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris,* vol. I, *Libraries,* Washington, D. C., 1932.

LEMAY, H. "Le P. Hennepin, récollet à Paris," in *Nos Cahiers,* III, 1938, 105-140.—Text, p. 254 ff.

LEMIEUX, L. J. *The Governors-General of Canada,* 1608-1931, London, 1931.

LE SUEUR, W. D. *Count Frontenac,* London and Toronto, 1926.

LOMASNEY, P. J. "The Canadian Jesuits and the Fur Trade," in *Mid-America,* XV, 1933, 139-150.

The article is based mostly on Rochemonteix; pertinent passages from a few documents in the official archives are quoted.

LORIN, H. *Le Comte de Frontenac,* Paris, 1895.

The most elaborate study of Frontenac's two terms and a systematic apology for the governor. Lorin undoubtedly had a thorough knowledge of the archives; however, in his quotations from documents, a few words or a line or two lifted from the context have often been considered sufficient to prove the author's point. His criticism of the sources fall short of what one would be led to expect. Further, general references are given seemingly in support of the author's contentions, but when these references are examined nothing of what they purport to prove is found in them. An instance of this latter procedure will be found in the text, p. 214, note 9. His explanation of the "suppression" of the *Jesuit Relations* is an illustration of history a priori based on insufficient evidence. A peculiar feature of this study is the frequent use of rhetorical questions. This device is of course effective in suggesting answers, but unfortunately the least shred of evidence is lacking in support of these answers. Since the book was Lorin's doctoral thesis, it may be that this technique was adopted with an eye to the verdict of the examiners.

MASSICOTTE, E. Z. "Arrêts, édits, ordonnances, mandements et règlements conservés dans les archives du palais de justice de Montréal," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions,* series 3, XI, 1918, section 1, 147-174.

MATTESON, D. M. *Lists of Manuscripts concerning American History preserved in European Libraries and noted in their Published Catalogues and similar Printed Lists,* Washington, D. C., 1925.

[MELANCON, A.] *Liste des Missionnaires-Jésuites Nouvelle-France et Louisiane 1611-1800,* Montreal, 1929.

MUNRO, W. B. "The Office of Intendant in New France; a Study of French Colonial Policy," in *American Historical Review,* XII, 1907, 15-38.

MUNRO, W. B. *The Seigniorial System in Canada,* New York, 1907.

MYRAND, E. *Frontenac et ses amis,* Quebec, 1902. Is mainly concerned with Mme de Frontenac.

NOLAN, J. F. "The Liquor Problem and the Jesuit Missions in

New France," in *Acta et Dicta,* III, 1911, 91-141. Based almost exclusively on the *Jesuit Relations.*

PARKMAN, F. *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV,* Boston, 1891.

PARKMAN, F. *The Jesuits in North America in the XVIIth Century,* Boston, 1912.

PARKMAN, F. *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West,* Boston, 1907.

PARKMAN, F. *The Old Regime in Canada,* Boston, 1892.

PARKMAN, F. *Pioneers of France in the New World,* Boston, 1892.

Parkman, wrote James Truslow Adams, "falls short of complete comprehension of the part that the church and the Jesuits had in the contest," *Dictionary of American Biography,* XIV, 250, *Parkman.* "His treatment of the Jesuits is open to criticism as frequently lacking in fairness to their point of view," R. G. Thwaites, *France in America,* New York and London, 1907, 297. Examples of the lack of fairness mentioned by Thwaites have been pointed out in this volume.

RAVIGNAN, F. X. DE. *De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites,* Paris, 1860.

RIDDEL, W. A. *Rise of Ecclesiastical Control in Quebec,* New York, 1916.

In spite of an impressive list of mnauscript sources, this doctoral dissertation is a third hand account. The quotations from documents in series C 11A—listed and presumably consulted—are actually taken from Parkman. The writer seems to have been unaware of the extent of this series. Even some references to Charlevoix are given as in Parkman.

ROCHEMONTEIX, C. DE. *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII^e siècle,* 3 vols., Paris, 1895-1896.

Rochemonteix made an extensive use of the Jesuit Archives, of the documents in print when he wrote—Clément, Margry, *Jugements et délibérations*—of contemporary accounts. He merely scratched the surface of the manuscript official correspondence.

ROY, J.-E. *Rapport sur les Archives de France relatives à l'histoire du Canada,* Ottawa, 1911.

SAIT, E. M. *Clerical Control in Quebec,* Toronto, 1911.

SCOTT, H.-A. *Bishop-Laval,* London and Toronto, 1926.

SULTE, B. *Histoire des Canadiens-Français,* 8 vols., Montreal, 1882-1884, vol. V.—Text, p. 260, note 23.

The few pages Sulte published in the *Revue Canadienne,* n. s., XXI, 1918, première partie, 162-164, under the title "La traite des Jésuites," should be read. He wrote: "On décida que les Jésuites feraient la traite." Who is *"on"*? "D'ailleurs, la pauvreté, les misères et les privations des hommes héroïques qui prêchaient l'évangile aux sauvages du Haut-Canada, du Lac Supérieur, du Wisconsin et du Michigan, sont connues de tous ceux qui s'occupent d'histoire et font justice de toutes ces accusations mahonnêtes," that is, accusations of trade. After a disquisition on the word *magazin* found in Lahotan, we are told that the Jesuits were not *commerçants*. The last sentences of this article must be quoted: "J'ai tout lu dans les anciens livres, en regardant par derrière la toile ou derrière la page!—et je pardonne a ceux qui se trompent. Quant à ceux qui mentent, ma police les surveille; je ne crois qu'après avoir vu."

SALONE, E. *La colonisation de la Nouvelle France,* Paris, s. d., Second edition.

SALONE, E. "Les sauvages du Canada et les maladies importées de France au XVII^e et XVIII^e siècle: La picote et l'alcoolisme," in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris,* n. s. IV, 1907, 7-20.

SHEA, J. G., ed. *History and General Description of New France. By the Rev. P. F. X. Charlevoix, S. J.,* 6 vols., New York, 1866-1872.

SURREY, N. M. *Calendar of Manuscripts in Paris Archives and Libraries relating to the History of the Mississippi Valley to 1803,* 2 vols., Washington, 1926-1928.

VILLIERS DU TERRAGE, M. DE. *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle dans le Golfe du Mexique* (1684-1687), Paris, 1931.

WINSOR, J. *Cartier to Frontenac,* Boston, 1894.

WINSOR, J. *Narrative and Critical History of America,* 8 vols., Boston, 1884-1889, vol. IV.

WRONG, G. M. *The Rise and Fall of New France,* 2 vols., New York, 1928.

INDEX

Abenaqui, 63.
Acadia, churches abandoned in, 117.
Adario, 156.
Ailleboust, Louis d', 157; against brandy trade, 69.
Aillon, Joseph de la Roche d', 261.
Albanel, Charles, 158, 159; in *Memoire sur la conduite,* 230; to Hudson Bay, 107; at Cap de la Madeleine, 225, 233; and Sulpicians, 239.
Albany, 183, 198, 199.
Aldermen, election of, 6.
Algonquins, 38, 40, 47, 144, 158.
Allain, declaration, 185, 197.
Allet, François d', 218; returns to France, 227; gives memoir to Arnauld, 237.
Allouez, Claude, 179.
Amalgamation of French and Indians, 37; Jesuits on, 56; objections to, 69; d'Aillon on, 261.
Amsterdam, Hennepin at, 260.
Amyot de Villeneuve, Mathieu, 90.
André, Louis, 201.
Andreussy, 250.
Andros, Sir Edmund, 183, 200, 234.
Anne of Austria, 75.
Antwerp, Hennepin at, 260.
Archives, 121, 122, 157.
Argenson, Pierre de Voyer, vicomte d', 157.
Arnauld, Antoine, 217, 218, 222; friend of author of *Récit,* 236; interview with Queylus, 236-237.
Augustinus, 141.
Auteuil, Denis-Joseph de Ruette d', 21; exiled, 12; François-Madeleine-Fortuné, sieur de Monceau et d', 32.
Avaugour, Pierre Du Bois, baron d', 157; allows brandy trade, 73-74; recall, 75; death, 76.
Bagot, Jean, 25.
Bailloquet, Pierre, 249.
Barbier, *alias* Minime, Gabriel, 250, 251.
Bardy, Claude, sermon, 226, 230.
Barrois, 28.
Bartering, 134 ff.
Baugy, Henri de, 156, 197.
Bazire, Charles, 183.
Bécancour, René Robineau de, 210.
Bellefonds, Bernardin Gigault, marquis de, 14, 31, 32.
Belmont, François Vachon de, 58.
Bellinzani, 112.
Bernières, Henri de, 24, 30.
Bernou, Claude, 128, 175, 177, 257, 258, 259; memoir of 1678, 176 ff., 184, 190, 191-192, 221; memoir of 1678 in *Récit,* 233, 234, 235, 237, 238.
Biard, Pierre, 136.
Bigamy said to be allowed in Canada, in *Memoire sur la conduite,* 224; in *Récit,* 228, 238.
Binet, Etienne, 138.
Bishops, French, on brandy trade, 113.
Boisseau, 128.
Bolduc, Louis, 210.
Boquet, Charles, 241.
Bourdon, Jean, 76.
Boursier, Joseph, 202, 225.
Bouteroue, Claude de, replaces Talon, 97; instructions, 98, 99; on brandy trade, 108, 109.
Boutet, Martin, 157.
Brandy, introduced by English, 69; attraction for Indians, 96, 110, 113, 115; said to be sold by Jesuits, 231; brandy at Prairie

de la Madeleine, 193 ff.; disorders caused by brandy, 5, 69, 70, 71, 74, 102, 108, 109, 111, 115, 116, 120, 129; investigation of disorders, 111, 115, 117, 121; views on disorders, Colbert, 110, in France, 122, Frontenac, 108, Talon, 108, Tronson, 110; brandy a means of conversion, 109, 110, 114, 120.

Brandy trade, 5, 26, 56, 72, 186; source of conflict in Canada, 69; mixed question, 104, 113; necessary for prosperity in Canada, 116; shareholder society to sell brandy, 184; reasons for continuance of sale of brandy, 74; memoir for and against, 119; vote on brandy trade, 120; restrictions on brandy trade annulled, 96; moderate sale to Indians, 118, 119; ordinance, of 1679, 122, 123, 129, 133; views on the brandy trade, early governors, 69, Colbert, 103, 107, 109, Dollier, 101, Frontenac, 102, 117, 133, Indians, 115, 117, 120, 193, Jesuits, 99, 107, 255-256, 266-267, Laval, 97, 121, 255-256, Lionne, 114, Queylus, 99, Recollects, 105, 106, 107, 255, 256, Sorbonne, 104, 111, 112, 113, Talon, 85, 98, 115, 119.

Brébeuf, Jean de, 145, 234.

Bretonvilliers, M. de, 94, 226.

Bruyas, Jacques, goes to New York, 234; and Hennepin, 242; writes to Frontenac, 198-199; writes to d'Allerais, 185.

Buisset, Luc, at Fort Frontenac, 187, 189, 249.

Buteux, Jacques, 149.

Cadillac, Antoine Laumet, *alias* de Lamothe, 39, 63, 129, 211, 263, 266, 270.

Canada, Church in, 84; brandy trade in, 69; Jesuit authority in, 22; measures for increasing population in, 42; Recollects return to, 36.

Cap de la Madeleine, 52, 158; Talon at, 92, 159; Jesuits trade at, 92, 225, 233.

Caraffa, Vincent, 144.

Carignan regiment, returns to France, 89; brings specie to Canada, 134.

Cataracouy, 52, 103, 109, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 199, 214; Frontenac to, 183; powwow of 1673, 197, 213; Jesuits opposed to, 240; see Fort Frontenac.

Cavelier, Jean, voyage to Canada, 240.

Cellot, Louis, 151.

Champagne, 223.

Champigny, Jean Bochart de, 9, 10, 19.

Champlain, Samuel de, 3, 157; opposes brandy trade, 69.

Chapais, Thomas, 83, 85, 90; authenticity of memoir of 1667, 88, 91.

Charlevoix, Pierre-François-Xavier de, on frenchification, 48; on Frontenac's accusations, 62; on Mézy's memoirs, 77, 78.

Chartier, Louis Théandre, 210, 225, 227, 238.

Chastelain, Pierre, in *Memoire sur la conduite,* 223, 224, 228.

Chaumonot, Pierre Joseph Marie, 51, 153, 185, 196.

Chaumont, Chevalier de, 83.

Clement IX, 164.

Clergy, diocesan, number in Canada, 92; charged with tormenting consciences, 27, opposing frenchification, 49; oppose brandy trade, 70; land owned in Canada by, 182; in memoir of 1678, 180; trade of, 180, 207.

Colbert, marquis de Croissy, Charles, 126.

Colbert, Jean-Baptiste, 6, 8, 15, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 160, 178, 184, 239, 244, 253; on powers of governors and intendants, 9; on disunion in Canada, 11; on frenchification, 40, 41, 48; blames Jesuits with regard to frenchification, 42, 48; on brandy trade, 103, 107, 112; on disorders caused by brandy, 109, 110; on moderate sale of brandy, 119; conversations with Dudouyt on brandy trade, 111 ff.; in *Récit,* 245; writes to Duchesneau, 15, 109, 119, 171; instructions to Frontenac, 20, 21; writes to Frontenac, 7, 9, 25, 27, 51, 54, 55, 107, 167, 209; La Salle's audience, 243, 244; writes to Laval, 43, 44; writes to Talon, 41, 42, 87; trade of clergy, 173; of Frontenac, 208-209; of Jesuits, 170, 195, 245.

Company of the Hundred Associates and Jesuit trade, 141.

Congés, 206, 207.

Consciences of people hampered, 93, 100, 101, 102.

Cree Indians kill Sioux, 167.

Crépieul, François de, 23.

Councillors of Sovereign Council, method of appointment, 7; exiled, 12.

Courcelle, Daniel de Rémy, sieur de, to Canada, 76, 86; returns to France, 102; and brandy trade, 94, 95; punishes brandy traders, 101; in *Memoire sur la conduite,* 224, 226, 227, 228, 230; Le Mercier's petition to, 160; and *Jesuit Relations,* 218; writes to Louis XIV, 78.

Coureurs de bois, 19, 57, 102, 206, 209, 264; number, 124; protection by Frontenac, 125, 210, 257.

Dablon, Claude, 27, 253, 259; Frontenac and Dablon, 127; petitions Frontenac for concession of Sault St. Louis, 174, 193; answers trade accusations, 201 ff.; in *Memoire sur la conduite,* 223; in *Récit,* 238.

D'Allerais, letters of Bruyas to, 185, 199.

Daniel, Antoine, 37.

Denison, declaration of, 185, 197.

Denonville, Jacques René de Brisay, marquis de, 270.

Denys, 90.

De Quen, Jean, answers accusation of trade, 154.

Des Chastelets, 149.

Description of Louisiana, 187, 188, 191, 252; Jesuits and, 256, 257.

Deslauriers, 242.

Detroit, 63, 64.

Divorce said to be allowed in Canada, 224-225.

Dollier de Casson, François, 11, 12, 16, 59, 60, 125; returns to Canada, 116; on brandy trade, 101, 110; expedition of 1669, 212.

Donnés, 143, 146; trade of, 144, 145.

Dubois des Prinzèles, Jean Baptiste, 94.

Duchesneau, Jacques, 9, 13, 19, 20, 28, 31, 32, 55, 60, 199; arrival in Canada, 8; criticized, 10; reproved by Colbert, 15, 119; and the brandy trade, 108, 109, 121; accused by Hennepin, 253, 254; defends himself, 210; accuses Frontenac of trade, 123 ff., 208; favorable to Jesuits, 10; land grant to Jesuits, 56, 175, 181; recall, 126, 128; writes to Colbert, 60-61.

Dudouyt, Jean, 125, 173, 258; complains against Hennepin, 253 ff.; writes to Laval, 111 ff., 253; and Frontenac's accusations, 28; on Frontenac's recall, 125-

126; interviews with Colbert, 111 ff.; in *Récit,* 245.
Duluth, Daniel Greysolon, sieur, 210, 212, 260; rescues Hennepin, 252.
Dumesnil, Jean Peronne, 147, 164; accusations against Jesuits, 107, 160, 231.
Dupont de Neuville, Nicolas, 121.
Durham, John George Lambton, lord, 88, 90.
Eastman, Mack, 83, 150; on Jesuit opposition to the brandy trade, 266, 267, 268; and *Récit,* 231.
Elgin, James Bruce, lord, 270.
Engagés, 143, 204; trade of, 146, 148.
English and the Jesuits, 197.
Estates General, 5, 6, 7.
Estrade, de l', supporter of Frontenac, 125, 254, 257.
Excommunication for selling brandy to the Indians, 73, 74; resented by Talon, 95.
Faillon, Etienne Michel, on *Récit,* 218, 227, 230.
Faire la traite, meaning, 138, 201, 259.
Félix, Marie, 182, 185, 196.
Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe-, 21, 58, 127, 213.
Ferrier, Father, 23.
First Establishment of the Faith, 36, 187; on amalgamation, 261, authenticity, 236, 260.
Fort Conti, 243.
Fort Frontenac, 192, 215, 232, 243, 249; trading post, 214; La Salle at, 183; Indians at, 189; frenchification at, 181, 186 ff.; settlers at, 187, 188; see Cataracouy.
Fort Ste Anne, 89.
Fort St. Jean, 89.
Fort St. Louis, 89.
Fox River, Jesuit mission on, 248.
Frémin, Jacques, 55, 158, 159, 193; helps Frontenac, 192; goes to France, 194; trade letter in memoir of 1678, 191, 195-196; in *Récit,* 233, 244.
French claims in North America, 175.
Frenchification, 5, 35 ff., 186; of girls, 46-47; and Frontenac, 49 ff., 55, 60-61, 62, 133; change of policy, 54, 57; at Fort Frontenac, 181, 186 ff.; and clergy of Canada, 49; Jesuits, 41, 42, 49, 52, 181; Colbert, 40, 43; Laval, 45, 50; La Salle, 191; Le Jeune's plans for, 36; Queylus, 45; Raudot, 64; Recollects, 49, 53, 56; Souart, 45; Sulpicians, 44, 46, 50, 58; Talon, 40 ff., 48.
Frontenac, Louis de Buade, comte de Palluau et de, 8, 184, 191, 239, 245, 256, 263, 266, 270; instructions of Louis XIV, 20, of Colbert, 21; arrival in Canada, 5, 20, 22; ciphered letters, 23, 53, 166; to Cataracouy, 183; administration, first term, 4, 13, 128, 133; brandy trade, 120 ff., 105, 108, 117, 133; answers petition of Indians, 116, 120, 193; frenchification, 49, 51, 55, 133, 181; trade of clergy, 107; accusations against Jesuits, 20, 24, 29, 166; and the Jesuits with regard to the brandy trade, 102 ff.; trade of the Jesuits, 147, 165, 168, 173, 206; calls Jesuits traitors to France, 197; debts of Jesuit college of Quebec, 233; helped by Frémin, 192, by Lamberville, 200; refuses land grant to Jesuits, 174, 193; prevents building a chapel by Jesuits, 194; Recollects allies of Frontenac on brandy question, 106, 254 ff.; Duchesneau, 123 ff.; Frontenac accused of trade, 167, 168, 199, 206 ff.; praises La Salle, 213; Frontenac and Perrot, 127, 211; and

Sovereign Council, 8, 133; in *Récit,* 219 ff.; coureurs de bois supported by, 125, 210, 257; memoirs against, 12, 13; Louis XIV's warning, 15, 29; recall, 16, 18, 124-128; writes to Bellefonds, 14, 31; to Colbert, 21-22, 23-24, 25-26, 50-51, 102, 198-199; to Louis XIV, 53-54, 58; to Pontchartrain, 62.

Frontenac, Anne de la Grange-Trianon de Neuville, Mme de, 28, 58, 59, 125, 128, 257.

Gage, Thomas, 219.

Galinée, René François Bréhan de, 237, 240; expedition of 1669, 212; on La Salle, 243; returns to France, 227; author of *Récit* is friend of, 215, 217, 233, 234, 236.

Ganneousse, Iroquois village, 188.

Garnier, Charles, 234.

Garnier, Julien, letter on Jesuit trade, 204 ff.

Girouard, Désiré, on Jesuit trade, 258, 269-270.

Godefroy, sieur de Linctot, Jean-Baptiste, 90.

Gosselies, Hennepin at, 260.

Governors against brandy trade, 69.

Goyer, Olivier, 17.

Green Bay, Jesuit mission, 247.

Groseilliers, Médard Chouart, sieur des, 197.

Guercheville, Antoinette de Pons, marquise de, 136.

Harel, Georges, 252.

Harrisse, Henry, 218.

Hazeur, François, 182, 196.

Hennepin, Louis, 249; at Fort Frontenac, 187; to Kenté, 188; to Iroquois country, 242; gets Iroquois dictionary, 182; returns to France, 252; defends Jesuits, 251; accuses Jesuits of trade, 252-258.

Henry IV, 3.

Hilaret, Moïse, 248.

Histoire chronologique, manuscript, 262.

Hospitalières, 164, 177, 202.

Hudson Bay, Albanel to, 197.

Hunault, André, 249.

Hurons, 35, 36, 38, 40, 110, 261; in seminary, 37-38; petition Frontenac to restrict brandy trade, 115, 193.

Illinois Indians, 61, 253, 259.

Indians, effect of brandy on, 70, 71, 72; attraction of brandy on, 113, 115; petition to restrict brandy trade, 117; social organization, 50.

Iroquois country, 89, 199, 232, 250, 256; Hennepin to, 187, 242; Jesuits re-enter, 152; La Salle in, 213, 243.

Iroquois Indians, 45, 63, 103, 111, 199; girls, 47; build Fort Frontenac, 183; go to Fort Frontenac, 197; embassy to Montreal, 51; give children to Frontenac, 50, 51; at Prairie de la Madeleine, 187, 192; at Sault St. Louis, 175; war with Illinois, 253, 259.

Jesuits, number in Canada, 92; chapel, meeting place of the Estates General, 5-6; college of Quebec, cost, 226, debt, 229, 233; charged with allowing divorce, 224, being brandy traders, 225, 231, encroaching upon royal authority, 22, 25, 27, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 268, tormenting consciences, 26, 30, 102, violating the seal of confession, 26, 223, 228, 239, opposing frenchification, 49, abandoning their missions, 235, 252, causing the Iroquois-Illinois war, 253, being traitors to France, 184, 197-198, 234, being opposed to Fort Frontenac, 240, attempting to poison La Salle, 241; ask for juridical investigation, 78, 160; oppose the brandy trade, 70, 74, 75, 97, 99, 102, 110, 114, 255, 266; are not opposed to moderate sale of brandy, 118; missions useless, 78; sedentary missions, 187; missions in the West, 234, at Michilimackinac, 182, at Sault Ste Marie, 183; revenue, 162, 163; land in Canada, 181, 220, 225, 228-229; decree of amortization, 174, 196; *Jesuit Relations,* 260, suppressed, 218, because false, 240; Jesuits complain of d'Avaugour, 75; in memoir of 1678, 180; accused by Dumesnil, 107; English and Jesuits, 197; accuse Hennepin, 242; defended by Hennepin, 251; accused by Hennepin, 253, 254, 256; Jesuits and Frontenac, 4, 32, 102 ff., 197; in Frontenac's letters, 20, 21, 23, 24, 35, 127; and Frontenac's recall, 19, 127; and La Salle, 213; accused by La Salle, 231, 240, 244; scheme of La Salle against Jesuits, 250; Mézy's accusations, 76, 78, 107; Jesuits and Queylus, 236; Laval, 85, 155; Recollects, 52, 105, 254 ff.; Ressan's accusations, 87, 88; Talon prejudiced against, 83; Jesuits praise Talon, 82, 98; in Talon's letters, 87 ff.

Jesuit trade, 93, 173, 235, 243; proofs, 185, 232, 253, 256, 265; accusers, 155; accusations, 136, 138, 141, 151, 154, 157, 164, 201; proofs, 185, 232, 253, 256, 265; inquiries and declarations, 141, 142, 151, 160, 203, 211; at Cap de la Madeleine, 225, 228; at Sillery, 150; with Mexico, 242; in the West, 247; in the Ottawa country, 185, 197, in St. Francis Xavier mission, 248; Colbert, 170, 173, 174; Dablon, 201 ff.; De Quen, 154; Dumesnil, 160; Frontenac, 147, 165, 168, 173, 206; Hennepin, 253 ff.; Garnier, 204 ff.; Girouard, 258, 269-270; Hennepin, 253 ff.; Kalm, 269; Lahontan, 196, 264; Lalemant, 165; La Salle, 212, 244-245, 250, 251; Le Jeune, 138 ff., 152; Le Mercier, 160; Le Tac, 262-265; Louis XIV, 167, 174; memoir of 1678, 180, 191; Mézy, 160; Parkman, 141, 143 ff., 153, 157, 207; in *Récit,* 225; Talon, 159; Vimont, 141.

Jolliet, Louis, 175, 179, 183, 215, 217, 243.

Kalm, Peter, on Jesuit trade, 269.

Kenté, 23; La Salle and Hennepin to, 188.

Kilistinou (Cree) Indians kill Sioux, 167.

La Chaise, François de, 121, 122.

Lachine, 63, 214.

Lahontan, Armand Louis de l'Om Darce, baron de, 156, 158, 197; on Frontenac, 7; on Jesuit trade, 196, 264.

Lake Erie, 251; trade monopoly on, 183.

Lake Michigan, trade monopoly on, 183.

Lake Ontario, 50, 232, 251; Frontenac to, 103.

Lake Superior, 183.

Lalemant, Jerome, 73, 149; answers accusation of trade, 165.

Lamberville, Jean de, 32, 198, 200; helps Frontenac, 185; letter to La Salle, 185, 200.

Lamothe, Antoine de, see Cadillac.

Langevin, 223.

Langlois, Charles Victor, 245.

La Rochelle, 244.

La Salle, Robert Cavelier, sieur de, 147, 173, 174, 179, 184, 187, 193, 194, 198, 212, 220, 236, 259, 260, 264, 266; arrives in Canada, 212; history in *Récit,* 240; journeys, 233, discoveries, 243; expedition of 1669, 212-213; to Mississippi prior to 1673, 179, 215, 216, 240, 244; Galinée on, 243; Frontenac's courrier, 213; goes to France, 213-214; to Kenté, 188; to France, 1677, 215, 242; brings in letters and memoirs, 173, 175, 178; interviews of 1678, 221, 244; attempt to poison, 241; seduced, 240; letters of, 216, 241-242, 247; letter of Lamberville to, 185; land grant at Sault St. Louis promised to, 174, 181; made proprietor of Fort Frontenac, 214; builds Fort Frontenac, 183; success in frenchifying the Indians, 181, 186 ff., 191; trading activities in the West, 200, 210, 212, 247; on Jesuits, 200, 213, 236, 244; reports on Jesuit preaching, 239; on baptism of Indians, 240; accuses Jesuits of trade, 211, 250, 251; in the West, 247; with Mexico, 242; proofs of Jesuit trade, 180, 232, 244-245; scheme against Jesuits, 250; friend of Recollects, 106.

La Taupine, Pierre Moreau *dit,* 208.

La Tour, Louis Bertrand de, 69, 73.

Laumet, Antoine, see Cadillac.

Lauzon, Jean de, 157; against brandy trade, 69.

Laval de Montigny, François de Montmorency-, 3, 21, 27, 30, 75, 162, 228, 237; arrival in Canada, 72, 155; to France, 25, 74, 102, 121, 127; obtains recall of d'Avaugour, 75; Hennepin's memoir against, 253, 254; and Jesuits, 79, 85, 155; in memoir of 1678, 180; and Recollects, 105, 254; and Talon, 83, 96, 99, 225; and brandy trade, 70, 72, 73-74, 97, 104, 114, 255; ordinance of 1679, 123; moderate sale of brandy, 118; said to be a trader, 237, to have opened a liquor store, 107, 163, 231; frenchification, 43, 45, 50.

Le Bohesme, Louis, 249.

Le Clercq, Chrestien, 40, 190, 260; *First Establishment of the Faith,* 236; on frenchification, 35, 39, 57; at Fort Frontenac, 186; against brandy trade, 118; copied by Hennepin, 252; Jesuits, 235.

Le Hâvre, Hennepin arrives at, 252.

Le Jeune, Paul, 134, 145, 149, 151; on frenchification, 35 ff., 41; letter on Jesuit trade, 138 ff., 152.

Leland, Waldo G., 177.

Lemay, Hugolin, on Hennepin, 254 ff.

Le Mercier, François, 79, 159; petition to Tracy, Courcelle and Talon, 78, 160.

Le Moyne, Charles, 90, 199, 241.

Le Tac, Sixte, 260, 262, 264.

Lionne, Hugues de, instructions to Tracy, 80, 114.

Lorette, 61, 185; mission at, 205.

Lorin, Henri, 14, 17, 18, 19, 113, 126, 128, 194, 230, 254, 255.

Louis XIII, 141.

Louis XIV, 6, 8, 10, 29, 31, 104, 178, 244; organizes government of New France, 4; instructions to Frontenac, 20-21; warns Frontenac, 13; on Frontenac's trade, 207, 209; Jesuit trade, 195; writes to Frontenac, 10, 13-14, 16, 29-31, 57, 124, 168, 170, 209; to Laval, 43, 44.

Louisiana, 64.

Maisonneuve, Paul de Chomedey, sieur de, against brandy trade, 69.

Major, Richard Henry, 216.
Margry, Pierre, 143, 148; edits memoir of 1678, 176, 177, 179, 184; edits *Récit,* 215, 245; mutilates *Récit,* 220-222, 239; authorship of *Récit,* 238; Major and Winsor on, 216.
Marquette, Jacques, 215, 216, 217.
Marriages of Indians and Whites, 42-43.
Martin, Félix, 268.
Mary of the Incarnation, 74, 156; on frenchification, 42, 46-47; Talon's administration, 98.
Massé, Ennemond, 136.
Memoire sur la conduite des Jesuites en Canada, author, 224, 226, 227; source of *Récit,* 223, 233.
Menar, supporter of Frontenac, 125.
Mézy, Charles Augustin Saffray, sieur de, 75, 76, 77, 94; accusations against Jesuits, 76, 77, 78, 80, 107, 160.
Michelet, Jules, 158.
Michilimackinac, 64, 247, 250, 252; Jesuit mission at, 182, 234, 247; trade at, 212; Lahontan at, 264.
Minet, journal of, 250, 251.
Minime, Gabriel, 249, see Barbier.
Missionaries, support of, 137-138.
Mississippi River, La Salle's commission to explore, 215; priority of discovery, 179, 217, 240, 244, in *Récit,* 222; Valley, 3.
Mohawks, mission re-opened, 152.
Mohegans (Mohicans), 61.
Montagnais, 36, 38, 158.
Montagne, see Mountain mission.
Montmagny, Charles Huault de, 157; against brandy trade, 69; on Jesuit trade, 203.
Montreal, 20, 21, 59, 63, 109; seminary of, 23; sodality at, 45, 61; frenchification, 45.
Mont Valérien, 236.
Morel, Thomas Joseph, 224, 225; favors bigamy, 238.
Morale pratique des Jesuites, 218, 223.
Mountain Mission, 59, 61, 63.
New Discovery, 188, 252, 256, 257, 258, 259.
New England, 39; laws against brandy trade, 114.
New Foundland, 3.
New France, Church in, 104; colonization, 40, government, 4, 75.
New Netherlands, 39, 116, 183, 185.
New Orange, 251.
New Voyage, 188, 189, 252.
New Spain, 8.
New York, 183, 199, 251.
Nicolet, Jean, 37.
Notre-Dame de Foy, 23.
Notre-Dame des Anges, 36, 37.
Nouvel, Henri, 197, 249.
Onondaga Indians, 200; mission re-opened among, 152.
Onontio, 116, 182.
Ottawa Indians, 111, 215; country, 183, 197, 204, 249; Jesuits in, 200; Jesuits trade in, 92, 93, 185.
Pamiers, Bishop of, 236.
Parkman, Francis, 143, 147, 154, 159, 176; and *Récit,* 216, 221, 222; on Jesuit trade, 136, 141, 143 ff., 153, 157, 165, 170, 203, 247; trade of *engagés,* 204; letter of Ragueneau, 145-146; and declaration of the directors of the Company of New France, 142; La Salle accusations, 212, 248; Dumesnil's memoir, 162.
Pascal, Blaise, 151.
Passports needed by missionaries, 23, 30.
Patoulet, Jean-Baptiste, 86, 224.
Perrot, François Marie, 21, 58, 59, 127; trading activities, 210, 211, 212.

Petraea, Bishop of, 48, 72, 79, 82, 87, 88, 114; see Laval.
Peyras, Jean-Baptiste, 121.
Pierson, Philippe, 252.
Pontchartrain, Louis Phélipeaux, comte de, 62.
Poutrincourt, Jean de Biencourt, sieur de, 136, 137.
Port Royal, 137, 236.
Prairie de la Madeleine, 55, 57, 61, 115, 185, 186; migration of Indians, 175, 181; land grant, 86; Jesuit mission at, 187, 191, 192 ff.; brandy at, 194.
Provincial Letters, 151.
Quebec, founded, 3; Recollects at 21; Seminary of, 24; population, 155.
Queylus, Gabriel de Thubière de Lévy de, 226; on brandy trade, 99, frenchification, 45; returns to France, 227; complains of Jesuits to Arnauld, 236-237.
Raffeix, Pierre, 192.
Ragueneau, Paul, 145, 164; letter to Caraffa, 144; Jesuit revenues in Canada, 163-164; said to have opened a liquor store in Quebec, 107, 163, 231.
Ranuyer, M., 116.
Raudot, Antoine Denis, 64.
Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée, author, 235-236, 238; text of, 215 ff.; authenticity, 217; provenance, 218; criticism, 219 ff.; source of, 220 ff.; memoir of 1678 in, 233; La Salle's history in, 240.
Recollects, 20, 21, 24, 27, 36, 51, 133, 180, 235, 251, 265; to Canada, 25, 27, 30, 31, 36, 100; at Fort Frontenac, 187; and brandy controversy, 105, 106, 107, 255; and frenchification, 35, 49, 53, 56; and trade, 261; in *Récit,* 220; and Jesuits, 52, 105, 254 ff.; and La Salle, 106; and Laval, 105, 254.
Relations par lettres, 64.
Renaudot, Eusèbe, 128, 178, 238, 257, 258, 259.
Renault, Jacques, 154.
Renty, Hennepin at, 260.
Reserved sin to sell brandy to Indians, 27, 96, 102, 109, 119, 120; Colbert's objection to, 117; restricted to terms of ordinance of 1679, 122; in *Récit,* 232.
Ressan, Octave Zapaglia, sieur de, 84, 87, 88, 92.
Réveillaud, Eugène, 265; on Le Tac, 262; on Jesuit trade, 264.
Richelieu, Cardinal, 141.
Richelieu River, 89.
Richez, 28.
Riverin, Denis, defends Duchesneau, 126, 128.
Robert, 225.
Robin, 137.
Rochemonteix, Camille de, 29, 128, 169, 180, 218, 270.
Sagard Theodat, Gabriel, on amalgamation, 56; on trade, 261.
St. Aubin, 28, 29.
Sainte-Famille, 85, 225, 263; in *Récit,* 238.
Sainte Marie, Huron mission, 144; farm at, 145.
Saint Francis Xavier, Jesuit mission, 253.
Saint-Germain, Hennepin at, 253, 254.
Saint Lawrence Valley, 3.
Sault Ste Marie, 167, 197, 249; Jesuit mission, 183, 234, 247; Lahontan at, 264; La Salle at, 247.
Sceaux, 114, 245.
Seal of confession said to be violated, 26, 223; in *Récit,* 228, 238, 239.
Seminary for Indian children, 35, 36 ff., 38, 40, 41, 42; at Sillery, 39.
Shea, John Gilmary, 143.
Sillery, 40, 61, 148, 150; seminary

at, 38; mission, 206; trade at, 149.
Sioux, killed by Cree, 167, 183; in *Récit,* 234.
Socoqui Indians, 185.
Sorbonne, on brandy trade, 104, 108, 111, 113, 115, 117.
Souart, Gabriel, on frenchification, 45; returns to France, 227.
Sovereign Council, created, 4; and Frontenac, 5 ff., 133; reorganized, 8; and brandy trade, 95, 97, 98.
Sully, Maximilien de Béthune, duc de, 3.
Sulpicians, 20, 21, 23, 51, 52, 93, 202, 236, 267, 270; frenchification, 44, 45, 46, 50, 58, 60, 61; brandy trade, 70, 99, 107, 110; in memoir of 1678, 180; in *Récit,* 227; Albanel, 239; and La Salle, 213.
Sulte, Benjamin, 141, 264.
Syndic, suppressed, 7.
Tadoussac, brandy trade at, 64, 117.
Talon, Jean, 6, 10, 22, 36, 42, 45, 163, 227, 228, 229, 233; to Canada, 40, 160; second term, 44, 89, 98, 99, 100; instructions to Talon, 75, 79; returns to France, 102; and the brandy trade, 85, 95, 96, 98, 108, 111; writes memoirs on brandy question, 108, 109, 115, 119; and frenchification, 40, 45, 48; memoir of 1667, 88 ff., 159, 221, 238; at Cap de la Madeleine, 159, 160; and Laval, 83, 94, 225; and Jesuits, 82, 83, 86, preached against by Bardy, 226, 230; depositions in the hands of Talon, 224, 228, 239; Le Mercier petition to, 160; writes to Colbert, 22, 40, 41, 82, 84, 86, 100; to Louis XIV, 78; to Oliva, 82.
Thouret, letter of La Salle to, 247.
Three Rivers, Jesuit land near, 229.
Tonti, Henri de, 241, 249, 260.
Toulouse, University of, decision on brandy, 112.
Tracy, Alexandre de Prouville, marquis de, 48, 88; to Canada to investigate Mézy, 76; instructions, 80, 114; and brandy trade, 94; writes to Louis XIV, 78, 79; Le Mercier petition to, 160; returns to France, 84, 94, 223.
Trade, defined, 133; clandestine, 123; of clergy, 31, 107, 168, 170, 180; of *engagés,* 146-147, 148; of *donnés,* 144, 145, 146; of officials in New France, 206-207; of servants of clergy, 170, 171; at Prairie de la Madeleine, 191; at Sillery, 149, 150; Sagard on, 261; see Frontenac, Jesuits, Laval.
Traite, traitte, defined, 133; *traiter,* 259; *faire la traite,* 135, 136.
Tronson, Louis, 11, 12, 16, 58, 125, 172; brandy question, 110 ff.; given a memoir by La Salle, 244; writes to Bailly, 60; to Dollier, 11, 12, 16, 58-59, 60, 116, 121, 125; to Lefebvre, 110, 170; to Perrot, 122; to Ranuyer, 60, 116.
Trouvé, Claude, 252, 253.
Ursulines, 46, 55, 164, 202; and frenchification, 47, 61.
Utrecht, Hennepin at, 260.
Vaultier, 253, 254.
Vergne, abbé de la, 219.
Villeray, Louis Rouer, sieur de, and Frontenac, 21, 24, 28, 31; exiled by Mézy, 76; and Dumesnil, 160.
Villiers du Terrage, Marc de, 250.
Vimont, Barthélemy, 38, 42, 141, 149.
Winsor, Justin, on *Récit,* 216.
Zapaglia, see Ressan.

Date Due

[redacted]			

F1030 .F9274
Frontenac and the Jesuits / by Jean
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00137 1998